Vol. XXVIII. JULY, 1951. No. 3.

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance,* 15/-.

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Wellington, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, Banyo, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Launceston, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Very Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.
Diocese of Cairns—Rev. E. C. Clifford, O.S.A., Tully, Q.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Three Springs, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Waratah, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Bright, Vic.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Junee, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The
Australasian Catholic Record
A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction
"Pro Ecclesia Dei." *St. Augustine.*

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 191
Decree of S.S.C. of the Holy Office about the Rotary Clubs—Decree of S.S.C. of the Holy Office about the 'great prostration in the Byzantine Rite—Decree of S.S.C. of the Holy Office on the consecration of a bishop without canonical provision—Decrees of S.C. of Propaganda changing the boundaries between: 1, Sydney and Bathurst; 2, Brisbane and Toowoomba; 3, Adelaide and Port Augusta.
GOD AND HIS GRACE .. Rev. Cornelius Roberts, D.D., Ph.D. 195
BISHOP WILLSON, VIII,
Right Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, V.G. 203
DOGMATIC THEOLOGY .. .. Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D. 212
The Theology of the Mass, IV.
MORAL THEOLOGY .. Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 224
Absolution from Reserved Cases—Sins of "divorced" persons—Baptism of children who will not attend Catholic Schools.
CANON LAW .. Right Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, D.C.L., P.P. 232
Marriage of New Australians by National Chaplains—Domicile of New Australians—Trading forbidden to clerics and religious—Validity of Dispensation from Mixed Religion when necessary promises are not obtained—Community Chapels in camps for New Settlers—New faculty to dispense from Eucharistic fast.
LITURGY .. .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 241
Moving of chalice veil—Customs against rubrics—Manner of assisting at Mass—Oratio super populum—Some suggested reforms of the Roman Breviary.
HOMILETICS .. .. Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D. 248
The Presence of God.
NOTES 250
Burchard's *Liber Notarum*—Heinrich Pesch, S.J. (1854-1926).
BOOK REVIEWS 263
The Glorious Assumption of the Mother of God (Duhr); *Early Christian Baptism and the Creed* (Crehan); *The Book of Psalms* (*Edit.* Catholic Biblical Association of America); *Praelectiones Biblicae, Propacaeutica Biblica* (Simon-Prado); *The Church in the Christian Empire, Vol.* I (Palanque-Bardy-de Labriolle); *Greatness of the Soul and the Teacher* (St. Augustine, *Edit.* Plumpe-Quasten); *Life of St. Antony* (St. Athanasius. *Edit.* Plumpe-Quasten); *The Catholic University of America,* 1903-1909. *The Rectorship of Denis J. O'Connell* (Barry); *Newman's University: Idea and Reality* (McGrath); *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality* (*Edit.* Fedatov); *Neurosis and Sacraments* (Keenan); *Vessel of Clay* (Trese); *The Foundations of Philosophy* (Fleming); *A Philosophy of Form* (Watkin); *"Mission to the Poorest* (Loew); *Who are the Sisters of Mercy?* (Goodman); *Mental Prayer and Modern Life* (Lehner); *This Perverse Generation* (Michaels) [p. 194]; *The Priest in the Modern World* (Card. Suhard) [p. 202]; *Lisheen* (Sheehan) [p. 211]; *The Faith of the Roman Church* (Martindale) [p. 223].

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a, die, Julii, 1951.

Official Documents

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

DECREES.

I.

Wednesday the 20th of December, 1950

The question has been put to this Supreme Sacred Congregation whether it is lawful for Catholics to inscribe themselves in the Association commonly called *Rotary Club.*

The Eminent Fathers entrusted with the safeguarding of faith and morals, with previous vote of the Consultors, gave answer in the plenary session held on the above date, as follows:

"Clerics may not join the Association or be present at meetings of the *Rotary Club*; lay persons should be exhorted to keep the ruling of Canon 684 of the Code of Canon Law".

On the 26th of the same month, our Most Holy Lord Pope Pius XII, by Divine Providence Pope, in an audience granted to the Most Reverend Assessor of the Holy Office, approved the above resolution and ordered it to be published.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Holy Office, 11 January, 1951.

MARINUS MARANI, *Notary of the S.S.C.H.O.*

II.

To a question put to the same S.S.C.H.O., namely:

"Whether the great prostration (gonyklisia), where it has come into use in the celebration of Mass of the Byzantine Rite, should be made after the words of Christ pronounced in the consecration of the bread and wine, or only after the words of the *Epiclesis*".

The Eminent Cardinals, in the same session of Wednesday, 20 January, gave answer as follows:

Yes to the first part; *No* to the second.

On the following Thursday, the Holy Father, having heard the report of the Most Reverend Assessor approved the resolution of the Eminent Fathers and ordered it to be published.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Holy Office, 12 February, 1951.

MARINUS MARANI, *Notary.*

III.

On the consecration of a Bishop without canonical provision

The S.S.C.H.O. with special faculty granted by the Supreme Pontiff has issued this Decree:

A Bishop of whatever rite or dignity, who consecrates a person not nominated by the Apostolic See nor confirmed by the same Apostolic See and likewise the person who receives episcopal consecration from his hand, even if they are compelled by grave fear (c. 2229, § 3, 3°) incur *ipso facto* excommunication reserved *specialissimo modo* to the Apostolic See.

This decree shall have force from the very day of its promulgation.

Given from the Palace of the Holy Office, 9 April, 1951.

MARINUS MARANI, *Notary, S.S.C.H.O.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.
SYDNEYEN. — BATHURSTEN.
DECRETUM

De Finium Dioecesium Mutatione.

Exc.mus D.nus Ordinarius Bathurstensis, plene consentiente E.mo Cardinali Ordinario Sydneyensi, preces obtulit ad hanc S. Congregationem de Propaganda Fide, ut in bonum fidelium pars territorii Archidioecesis Sydneyensis aggregaretur dioecesi Bathurstensi et proinde fines hoc modo immutarentur, ut limites a Monte, vulgo appellato Boonbourwa, relinquant Montes Magnos Dividentes, scillicet, vulgo Great Dividing Range, et alia iuga continentia prius versus meridiem et postea versus occidentem sequantur usque ad confluentem fluminis vulgo vocati Coorongooba Creek et fluminis appellati Running Creek, cuius cursum inde retineant usque ad flumen vocatum Capertee River. Ex illo loco limites linea recta prius versus meridiem et postea versus occidentem indigitentur usque ad Montem vocatum Canobla, ex quo Monte, retinendo alia iuga continentia, iterum in Monte appellato MacLean tangant Magnos Dividentes Montes, scilicet Great Dividing Range et postea sequantur antiquos fines.

Poro haec Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, rei opportunitate perpensa, de mandato Ss.mi Domini Nostri Pii Div. Prov. Papae XII, vigore scilicet facultatum ab Eodem SS.mo Domino Nostro sibi specialiter concessarum et per totum iubilarem annum 1950 valiturarum, praesenti Decreto statuit ut praefata pars territorii, ut supra limitibus definita, cum clero et fidelibus ibi legitime exsistentibus, ab Archi-

dioecesi Sydneyensi dismembretur et Dioecescesi Bathurstensi perpetuo incorporetur, mutatis hac ratione finibus utriusque dioecesis.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, die 5 Maii anno Domini 1950.

P. Card. Fumosini Biondi, Praefectus.
+ Celsus Costantini, Archiep. tit. Theodos. a Secretis.

BRISBANEN. — TOOWOOMBAEN.

DECRETUM

De Finium Dioecesium Mutatione.

Exc.mus D.nus Ordinarius Toowoombaensis, plene assentiente Ex.mo Ordinario Brisbanensi, preces obtulit ad hanc sacram Congregationem de Propaganda Fide ut, in fidelium bonum pars territorii Archidioecesis Brisbanensis aggregaretur Dioecesi Toowoombaensi et proinde fines hoc modo immutarentur ut limites a fontibus fluminis vulgo vocati Ma Ma Heifer Creek, relinquant fastigia Montium qui apellantur Magni Dividentes, vulgo Great Dividing Range, et sequantur cursum supradicti fluminis usque ad confluentem eiusdem fluminis Ma Ma Heifer et fluminis Lockyer Creek. Ex illo loco limites linea recta versus septemtriones, superato cacumine Montis Perseverantiae, sequantur lineam meridianam 152', 10" longitudinis occidentalis usque ad punctum quo intercidit cum linea parellela 27' latitudinis meridionalis et postea eandem lineam usque ad Montes quibus nomen Blackbutt Range, quorum montium fastigia superando iterum tangant Magnos Dividentes Montes, scilicet Great Dividing Range et sequantur antiquos fines.

The remainder of this document, except for the names of the Dioceses, is substantially the same as in the preceding.

ADELAIDEN. — PORTAUGUSTAN.

DECRETUM

De Finium Dioecesium Mutatione.

Exc.mus D.nus Ordinarius Portaugustanus, plene assentiente Exc.mo D.no Ordinario Archdioecesis Adelaidensis, preces ad hanc S. Congregationem de Propaganda Fide obtulit ut in bonum fidelium pars territorii Archidioecesis Adelaidensis aggregaretur dioecesi Portagustanae et proinde fines immutarentur. Qua de causa tota paeninsula vulgo appellata Eyre aggregetur Dioecesi Portaugustanae et insuper a sinu vulgo Spencer limites novi sequantur limites civilium districtuum, qui vulgo vocantur "Hundreds" scilicet limites meridionales districtuum

Wanderah, Crystal Brook et Narridy; occidentales limites districtus Yacka Moorundie; limites meridionales supradicti districtus et etiam districtuum Andrews et Ayers; limites occidentales districtuum Kooringa et Apoingna, limites meridionales supradictorum districtuum et districtus Bright; limites occidentales et meridionales districtus Bower; partim limites meridionales districtus Beatty; limites occidentales districtuum Hay et Skurray necnon Fisher; limites meridionales huius districtus Fisher; limites occidentales districtuum Nildotti et Forster; limites meridionales distructuum Forster, Bandon, Chesson, Mindarie, Allen, Kekwick, et Mac Gorrery.

The concluding paragraph is the same as above.

W. LEONARD.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

THIS PERVERSE GENERATION, by Peter Michaels. London: Sheed and Ward, 1949. 7/6. 122 pages.

All will admit that something ails modern society generally. People respected for their knowledge and wisdom have repeatedly warned us that Western Civilisation is in danger of dissolution. We should at least examine their contentions.

Peter Michaels is concerned about prevalent world ills, in particular as they affect America. She attempts a thorough diagnosis, searching skilfully for the root causes. With an unsparing verbal scalpel she lays them bare in "This Perverse Generation," probing into the religious, social, vocational, intellectual, and ethical aspects of our civilisation. In this comprehensive examination the author, in her vigorous and trenchant style, makes sharp incisions that disclose disorders everywhere. The reader may be pardoned if he doubts that matters in America are as bad as indicated, or, alternatively, despairs of a recovery for this perverse generation. He may also find difficulty in understanding how Catholic Action, directed by leadership courses, the suggested panacea, is to be applied in each case. However, the enthusiasm of the author, which leads to some confusion and hyperbole in places, cannot fail to captivate the reader's interest and rudely awaken him to the gravity of many current dangers.

The book is attractively set out and can be read in sections, each of which will be found entertaining and instructive. It is a recall to the Catholic spirit that produced the solidarity of thought and security of life in the Middle Ages and the joyfulness of Merry England.

N.C.

God and His Grace

Summary: Our dependence on God is total. Mystery is inevitable when investigating grace, but this is no reason for abandoning established principles. Upholding the effectiveness of divine grace, as Sacred Scripture seems to require, Thomists meet difficulty in regard to human freedom. No real contradiction is involved.

The Thomist view misrepresented. This question is not about the name, *praedeterminatio physica*, but about the doctrine. Is the Thomist *doctrine*, which could also be called "decisive premotion," found in St. Thomas's works? Passages from *Contra Gentiles, De Potentia, De Malo, De Veritate*, the Commentary on the *Sentences*, and the *Summa Theologiae*. The Thomist doctrine on efficacious grace should be viewed in the whole synthesis of which it is a part.

The more we know about man's relation to God, the more we recognize the completeness of our dependence on Him. His causative influence extends to all created reality. He not only willed us into being, but our being continues to come from His almighty will as long as we exist. Did He cease to will our being, we should instantly relapse into nothingness. The same dependence pervades our activities: they are essentially dependent on Him for their beginning and their execution, since they are creaturely and contingent. Our actions issue from us and are truly ours, but we are not the first principle, or starting-point of any one of them.

All this holds even in the purely natural order. What shall we say of that privileged order which exceeds the essence and the powers and the exigencies of any creature? Our elevation to a supernatural destiny that renders us like to God, "because we shall see Him as He is," and makes us "sharers in divine nature," has placed us, by an additional and an absolute title, in the merciful hands of our heavenly Father. Truly, "We are not sufficient even to think anything of ourselves as of ourselves: but our sufficiency is from God" (II Cor., iii, 5).

To speak of grace is as difficult as to speak of God, for it is to speak of the counsels and operations of an Infinite Being, whose ways are not our ways. With all the aids that faith gives, for us voyagers, God dwells in inaccessible light, clothed in the mystery of His very perfection. Seemingly easy terms, like *being* and *will* and *cause*, have vastly other senses when predicated of the Infinite. Nor must we forget that created being has its mysteries, too, and one of these lies in the noble power of free choice.

If sooner or later, when trying to understand the relations between God and His creatures, we meet a barrier of mystery, there is no occasion for surprise. How, for example, can the human mind, which

is certain of both God's unchangeability and His freedom in creating, reconcile the one with the other? Reason, if it goes deep enough, learns its own limitations by encountering apparent contradiction. Revelation, couched as it is in human concepts, does not dispel the obscurity which St. Paul regarded as normal in our present state and which he contrasted with the vision to come.

Little wonder, then, if what Sacred Scripture tells us about divine grace should involve deep mystery. There appears to be conflict, in particular, between what it says about the efficacy of grace, on the one hand, and the freedom of man's will, on the other; but this is no valid reason to jettison either of those truths. The Thomists hold fast to both, maintaining that God can truly cause us to do freely the action He appointed. If this involves an apparent contradiction, so do the mysteries of the Blessed Trinity, the hypostatic union, and transubstantiation. The Father and the Son are really distinct, and yet are one Being: an apparent contradiction which Sabellius ventured to solve by denying the real distinction. Rationalists exploit divine revelation by representing the apparent contradictions as real ones. In an unexpected quarter the old argument has once again been raised against the Thomists that they posit a neat contradiction in regard to efficacious grace and free will.

The grace in question is that which the Almighty employs to obtain the acts that save us. Of it, St. Paul wrote: "Both willing and doing are something which God does in you, according to his good purpose: *Deus est enim qui operatur in vobis et velle et perficere* (lit., *operari*), *pro bona voluntate*" (Philipp., ii. 13). Other inspired authors taught that the human heart was entirely in the hands of God. Thus: "As the divisions of waters, so the heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord: whithersoever He will, He shall turn it" (Prov., xxi, 1). Echoing Philipp., ii. 13, the Second Council of Orange asserted: *"Quoties enim bona agimus, Deus in nobis atque nobiscum, ut operemur, operatur"* (Canon 9). The Doctor of Grace, St. Augustine, was well aware of the apparent contradiction between grace and free will, and yet he defended both. Grace, he said, does not destroy free volition; it makes, or causes, it. *"Certum est nos velle, cum volumus; sed ille (Deus) facit ut velimus bonum. . . . Certum est nos facere, cum facimus; sed ille facit ut faciamus, praebendo vires efficacissimas voluntati"* (*De gratia et libero arbitrio*, xvi, 32: ML 44,900).

Thomists claim that efficacious grace is efficacious of itself, because the power of God is in it. In other words, that God can and does move created wills to elicit their salutary actions. This premotion is not, as

it has been represented, (1) equivalent to a *vis necessitans,* but causes the act precisely as a free act. (2) It does not put the will out of action, but into action. (3) It does not cause the will to be predetermined *before it acts,* for then the only predetermination is in God's eternal decree. (4) Not the Thomist system, but only the name frequently given to the system since the 16th century, *praedeterminatio physica,* was introduced by Dominic Bannez, as its adversaries now admit. (5) To say, as has recently been said, that all St. Thomas's works rebel against the system, is a most amazing statement.

Let the Angelic Doctor speak for himself, beginning with the *Contra Gentiles*: "Certain people, not understanding how God can cause a motion of the will, have tried to explain the aforesaid authorities (Prov., xxi, 1, and Philipp., ii, 13) *wrongly,* namely, to say that God causes in us the willing and the doing, insofar as He gives us the power to will *but not that He causes us to will this or that*—for example Origen, in *Peri Archon,* Bk. III, defending free will contrarily to the aforesaid authorities" (*C.G.*, III, 89). The motion God imparts, be it noted, is not indeterminate, but to willing *this or that.* After quoting Isaias, xxvi, 12: *Omnia opera nostra operatus es in nobis,* St. Thomas adds: "Hence we have from God not only the strength, but also the action. Besides, Solomon's saying, *Quocumque voluerit, inclinabit illud,* shows that the divine causation extends not merely to the power of the will but also to the action" (*ibid.*). A comparison *a minore ad majus* is then made. If a tool cannot work except through the power of a workman, although it does not receive its form from him, the will which depends on God even for what it is, cannot act unless God applies it to action. "God, therefore, is not only the cause of the will, but also of willing" (*ibid.*). Agents in nature may affect our bodily dispositions, and created intelligences may persuade the intellect, but God alone can cause our choosing. "A disposition resulting from a bodily quality, or from intellectual persuasion, does not make the choice inevitable, and hence a man does not always choose what an angel incites to or a heavenly body inclines to; but a man always does choose what God works in his will: *semper tamen hoc homo eligit quod Deus operatur in ejus voluntate*" (C.G., III, 92).

In all created activity, God operates from within, not merely accompanying it, but applying the faculty to action—although the premotion is as unperceived as His omnipresence. The inwardness of His presence and operation in all things and actions is thus described in *De Potentia*: "God is the cause of every action, because He gives the power to act,

and because He preserves that power, and *because He applies it to action,* and because every other power acts by His power. When we add to this, that God is identified with His own power and that *He is within everything*—not as part of the essence but as holding it in existence—it follows that He acts in every agent immediately, *not excluding the operation of will and nature*" (*De Pot,* p. 3, a. 7).

God alone, by His omnipotence, can cause the will to do infallibly, yet freely, what He wants it to do. "God moves the will in an unalterable way, *because of the efficacy of the moving power, which cannot fail; but* owing to the nature of the moved will, whose relation to diverse objects is indifferent, *no necessity is induced* and liberty remains. So, too, in all things, divine providence works infallibly, and yet the effects issue from contingent causes contingently; because God moves all things proportionately, each in keeping with its condition" (*De Malo,* p. 6, a. *unico,* ad 3).

In the adaptation of His action to the nature of each thing, lies that sweetness in His powerful providence of which the Book of Wisdom speaks. Here is one of many allusions to it in St. Thomas: "God's will is exerted not only to get a thing done by the being that He moves, but also to get it done in accordance with that being's nature; and, hence, if the will were moved under necessity—which is discordant with its nature—this would be more repugnant to the divine motion than to move it freely, in keeping with its nature" (*S.T.,* I IIae, 10, 4, ad 1).

The only necessity the will is under is that of desiring happiness, or *bonum in communi.* Towards particular goods, it is by its nature indifferent. When it chooses them, its act is not the outcome of some inherent bias, as happens in natural agents. What they do is determined by their nature, or form. But the human soul is subject to no such restraint. Strange though it may seem, the native indeterminateness of the will is a reason why God intervenes in its actions, according to St. Thomas. Natural agents could be moved indirectly, through their forms; but voluntary agents, left undetermined by their forms, must be moved directly. "God is the cause of natural activity insofar as He gives and preserves whatever is the principle of activity in a thing, from which a determinate operation results of necessity, as, for example, when He preserves gravity in the earth, which is the principle of downward motion. Now, the human will is not determined to any one operation, but is indifferent to many, and thus it is in a kind of potentiality unless it is moved by something active" (*De Veritate,* q. 24, a.14).

Necessity would come from within; force, from without. If divine premotion is not necessitating, does it amount to force? No. God alters the will, as Scripture affirms, causing it to choose as He pleases, but this does not deprive it of its free mode of action. The will, being what it is, simply cannot be forced. The only necessity that ensues from the divine action is the necessity of infallible result. *"If God changes a man's will, He achieves this by His omnipotence, so that the will voluntarily wills the object of the change.* Thus the essence of force is absent. *Otherwise,* there would be a contradiction, if it were said that the will did not will the object towards which it was changed and was forced to it. The necessity arising out of force is contrary to the will" (*II Sent.,* d. 25, q. 1, a. 2, ad 1).

One of the best possible signs that St. Thomas viewed divine premotion in the same way as the Thomists is the fact that he experienced the same difficulties as they, which are mainly two. The first is contained in one of his own objections, in the following dilemma: Is it possible, or is it impossible, for the will not to will the particular thing to which God moves it? He answered: "If God moves the will to a particular thing, it is incompatible with this situation for the will not to be moved to that thing, but it is not impossible simply. Hence it does not follow that the will is moved by God with necessity" (*S.T.,* I IIae, 10, 4 ad 3). The Thomists' answer is the same: it is impossible *sensu composito,* but it is possible *sensu diviso*—a celebrated distinction, which states what they affirm but is not intended to prove anything. Possibility *sensu diviso* means that the will retains its radical freedom.

The other objection which St. Thomas significantly felt is that, by making God the author of our actions, we seem to make Him responsible for sins. The Saint answered this often, doing so at some length in his Commentary on the *Sentences.* To the question, Is the act of sin, as an act, from God?, he replies that two opinions were mentioned by the Lombard. One asserted that all the will's actions, as actions, were caused by God, and this is right. The other, that they were not, and this is very close to error, because it would make the created will a first principle, or source, of action and being. "On this question," he writes, "two opinions are mentioned by the Master. One said that all such actions, as actions, are from God, but insofar as they are deformed they are not from God, but from man or the devil. The other opinion said that acts of sin are not in any way from God, not even as actions".

"The latter opinion is mentioned in the present Distinction; and

none, or few, hold it, because it is *very close to a twofold error.* First, because *it would seem to follow that there were many first principles.* The essential characteristic of a first principle is that it is able to act without the help and influence of a prior agent. Now, if the human will could produce an action whose author was not God, the human will would have the essential characteristic of a first principle. They try to answer this by saying that the will, while able to produce an action without the influence of a prior agent, nevertheless has its existence from another, and not from itself—as would be required to make it a first principle. But it seems incongruous that what has no existence of itself, could act of itself, seeing that what has no existence of itself, cannot even last of itself. A power always proceeds from an essence, and an action from a power; and as the essence is *ab alio,* the power and the action must be *ab alio*". A similar argument is added on the score that actions are realities, or things, and, therefore, if sinful actions were not from God, as things, He would not be the universal cause of being.

"Therefore, it must be affirmed with the first opinion that *the action, as an action, is from God,* and, as such, has no deformity. How this can be, may be considered as follows. In all things wherein defect occurs—owing to the second cause, not to the First Cause—the essence and goodness in the defective effect must proceed in its entirety from the First Cause. That the defect is attributable to the defective second cause, is seen in a limping walk, which arises from the walking-power through the medium of the tibia, so that, owing to a curvature in the tibia, a wryness results in the step of the walker. Thus the walking comes totally from the walking-power, but the defect, of wryness, in the step is not from this power but from the tibia only. The relation of God to the created will is similar: a relation of First Cause to second cause. No defect can occur on God's part, but the created will is liable to defect, and hence whatever is act and being and good, in the deficient act, sin, comes totally from the First Agent, God, through the will; but the defect in the act comes from the will in such a way as not to come from God" (*II Sent.,* d. 37, q. 2, a. 2).

Incompleteness is no doubt found in some of the Saint's references to free will, or to premotion: which only means that there was not need to state his theory fully every time he mentioned either one subject or the other. This applies to a certain passage in *II Sent.,* d. 39, q. 1, a. 1, showing that the will is responsible for its acts. St. Thomas here makes a distinction, which we have seen in the foregoing passages, between two

classes of agents in creation, the natural and the voluntary. Natural agents, he now says, do not in any way determine themselves, for their activities are fixed by the nature God gave them. The will, on the contrary, is not determined. "The will, of itself," he writes, "is indifferent towards many things, and its passing determinately into this action or that is from itself and not from any other determining agent". Remembering what St. Thomas means by the determination God gave natural agents, namely, their inherent necessity of acting in a given way, we see how he can say that the will, in contrast with natural agents, is not determined. Of course, it is not determined, but determines itself. He explicitly says elsewhere, e.g., in *Contra Gentiles,* III, 89, that God causes us to will *this or that,* but he does not call that "determining" the will. The only doubt suggested by this passage is whether the name introduced by Bannez, *praedeterminatio*, was the most suitable one.

No one claims that St. Thomas gave that much-abused name, or any name, to his system, which might also be called, let us say, "decisive premotion". Whatever the name, the Thomist teaching does not mean that the will is determined before it acts, but that God has decreed its action and moves it to do that particular action, freely: in other words, He moves it to determine itself. He is total cause, as First Cause; the will is total cause in another order, as second cause, and it alone elicits the action.

St. Thomas's teaching on the efficacy of grace is part of a magnificent synthesis of all created being, reducing all to unity in God—a unity which the human mind instinctively seeks. This unity is not an identity of being, confusing God and creature, but a unity of principle, or source, demanded by the very otherness and dependence of created being. That any creaturely reality, including volition, could begin except from God, is repugnant to the metaphysics of the Angel of the Schools. Although Aristotle's philosophy helped him to elaborate his system, the essentials are found in divine revelation. The Saint saw it in texts already quoted. He saw it in (cf. *S.T.*, I, 18, 4, ad I) St. Paul's pregnant assertion: *"In ipso vivimus et movemur et sumus"* (Acts, xvii, 28), and there is no better commentary, than the entire Thomistic synthesis, on the Apostle's other magistral formula: *"Ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso* (lit. *ipsum*) *sunt omnia*: *ipsi gloria in saecula. Amen"* (Rom., xi, 36). This is Thomism in a nutshell.

It is not sufficiently noticed that the Church, which has so often and so highly commended the teaching of St. Thomas, endorsed the

Thomist doctrine of premotion in the Catechism of the Council of Trent. In the exposition of the first article of the Creed (n. 22) we read: "Not only does God protect and govern by His providence all things that exist, but He also, by an internal virtue, *impels to motion and action whatever things move and act*, and he does so in such a manner that *although He hinders not the efficacy of second causes yet He anticipates it;* for His most secret influence extends to all things, and, as the Wise Man testifies, "reacheth from end to end mightily and ordereth all things sweetly" (Wis., viii, 1). Wherefore, the Apostle, when announcing to the Athenians the God whom they unknowingly venerated, said, "He is not far from every one of us: for in Him we live and move and are".

CORNELIUS ROBERTS.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

THE PRIEST IN THE MODERN WORLD. Translated from the French of Cardinal Suhard, Archbishop of Paris. New Life, Vol. 5, No. 1, July-August, 1950, pp. 125. 4/- (stg.).

On Maundy Thursday, 1949, Cardinal Suhard issued a pastoral on the Priesthood, now available to the English-speaking world under the above title. In doing that he has satisfied a hope that must have been entertained by numerous clerical readers of his earlier pastoral on the growth or decline of the Church to-day.

There was much in that challenging pastoral which made us look for its author's further thought on how he saw the role of the priest as leader in this crucial time of decision for all members of the Church. For those who are still waiting there now is the Cardinal's guidance on many points.

The author himself gives the outline of the pastoral's content: "In the first part we explain what will always form the essential and immutable nature of the priesthood. In the second part we show what this constitutive mission implies in the modern world. Then, in the third part, we indicate some of the necessary links created between the priest and community by his unique position in the human picture." (Page 6.)

Each part of this scholarly study is well supported with abundant notes; the translation is, for the most part, very readable, and the content is really something for meditation, not attempted summarisation.

Other studies on the Priesthood, such as Cardinal Manning's classic, are not eclipsed by this work, because each treats a subject in which there is no change: Christ's Eternal Priesthood. But the temporal conditions, in which the Church's ministers exercise that priesthood, do change for better or for worse. This pastoral shows that the significance for priests of those changed conditions in which the Church finds itself to-day, has been realistically grasped by the late Archbishop of Paris.

N.T.

Bishop Willson, VIII.

A FRIEND IN NEED.

Summary: Charity of Dr. Willson towards convicts—His interest in the case of John Murray—Murray accused, and convicted, of murder—Dr. Willson's fight for Murray's release rewarded—The Irish Exiles of 1848—Dr. Willson's view of Young Ireland Party—McEncroe's opinion—Dr. Willson's sympathy with the exiles—Three of the Irishmen imprisoned—Dr. Willson's appeal on their behalf to Sir William Denison—Reply of the Lieutenant-Governor—Smythe arrives from America to plan the escape of the exiles—Escape of John Mitchel—William Paul Dowling transported—Dowling's paintings in Hobart—Dowling paints portrait of Dr. Willson—Charitable interest of Dr. Willson in situation of the convicts—Interesting letter from a convict to Dr. Willson asking his help—Care of the orphans.

Driven to desperation by hunger and fever in the years of the Great Famine, many an Irish labourer defied British law with the deliberate intention of having himself taken into custody.

Who could censure a starving peasant for seizing by force or gathering by stealth the necessities of life greedily hidden away by a rapacious and unfeeling land owner? Everyone knew that detection would mean deportation; but whether on a convict ship or in a Penal Colony, a prisoner would be given enough to eat, if only in recognition of his value as a hewer of wood or a drawer of water. Human beings in general have always preferred slavery to death. Transportation, even for a petty offence, did involve enslavement for at least seven years. In most instances the duration of the sentence mattered not at all: no provision existed for the repatriation of banished convicts.

From other cases differed that of John Murray. Not to personal need, but to Christian sympathy for the hungry, must his heavy misfortunes be attributed. Seeing a poor family doomed to certain death should none be found to offer help, he did not hesitate to risk his own liberty. Entering the premises of a wealthy trader, he contrived to get food sufficient to save his afflicted neighbours. For himself it meant the open road to disaster. In the Ireland of that evil era no offence could go for long undiscovered. A merciless agent, grateful for any opportunity to display zeal in his master's interests, reported the breach of law to the police. John Murray's prompt arrest was followed by his removal to Van Diemen's Land.

At the end of a nightmare voyage the Catholics assembled on deck to hear an address delivered by the Port Chaplain, whose quiet dignity and unassuming manner won their immediate attention. Before them stood the Bishop of Hobart Town. The restless pastor of souls had

made it a self-imposed duty "to visit ships on their arrival, speak to all convicts of his own religion, warn them of what they should avoid, and encourage them to follow that course which experience had convinced him would prove beneficial to them: on landing, again visit them in their different locations as often as feasible; encourage them, remonstrate with them, hear their grievances—often times too well founded, sometimes not—and reprove sternly, when necessity required, the obstinate and hardened". Like hundreds of others, John Murray was somewhat bewildered to find himself greeted as a human being, received as a friend. Consoled and encouraged by the blessing of a saintly prelate of the Church, he looked towards the future resigned and hopeful.

Always did the Bishop's visits to the Penal Stations radiate sunshine: awaiting them John Murray kept his heart lifted up; recalling them he saw on darkest clouds a silver lining. The slowly moving years were not without anguish and pain leaving a heritage of bodily and mental distress. But the day of deliverance did at long last approach. Surely there would be a restoration to joy, to human friendships, to peace of soul. Dreams did not come true. When the hour struck to start life anew, John Murray paused confused and uncertain. Where should he begin? An unknown and uninviting road opened out before him. Must he be a wanderer on the face of the earth, alone and homeless, until the end?

On completion of their terms of servitude Catholic men of good disposition often approached the Bishop for advice as to occupation and residence. John Murray did not do so because Dr. Willson had not yet returned from Rome and England. Learning that farm work offered at Evandale, he made his way thither like a pilgrim, but without a pilgrim's inspiration. Youth and vigour had gone, leaving him poorly equipped to endure the heats and burdens of the day. Besides this, the liberated prisoner had to associate with men who were as ready to recall his unhappy past as he was anxious to forget it. Despair and depression seized upon John Murray. Discovering him wandering around in a state of intense nervous excitement, the police deemed it prudent to place him in safety. Selected for his quarters was a tiny cell, a dismal, uncomfortable hole in which to pass the black hours until sunrise. Unhappily, he had companions: two drunken revellers put away to await the magistrate's appraisement of their destructive gaiety. The time was March, 1855.

Dawn revealed a hideous tragedy: one of the arrested men—by name Bennett—had been battered to death. A lawbreaker, Cox, occupant

of a neighbouring cell, testified that the din of violence and quarrelling in which three seemed to participate had disturbed most of the night. Bennett's comrade in riotiousness, William Malon, vehemently asserted that Murray had perpetrated the foul deed. Murray said nothing in contradiction; in fact, in a highly excited condition he went on repeating: "I am guilty. I am guilty". To the coroner the legal decision presented no difficulty. The accused must be detained in Launceston jail to stand trial for murder at the July sessions of the Criminal Court.

In due course John Murray faced judge and jury. But where were the witnesses? Cox had died; Malon had mysteriously vanished. In the circumstances the prosecution could not well proceed; so the prisoner went back to his dungeon for another three months. In October, still bearing on his person marks of assault and aggression, he appeared once more, only to be once more remanded. The final act in the drama opened in January, 1856: the judge pronounced sentence of death. John Murray saw no reason for exultation when this verdict was commuted to imprisonment for life.

Such an item of news had long since ceased to attract attention in the colony. Why be surprised to hear of a released criminal running true to form and adding homicide to his list of accomplishments! But Dr. Willson viewed the affair in another light. Believing John Murray to be more sinned against than sinning, he took up the case with typical firmness of purpose. Always had he something of a kindred nature on hand. Those in distress sought his services: unasked he offered them. Murray could not have been adjudged responsible, argued the Bishop, had he been given for his defence "an acute and intelligent counsel".

Law books were consulted, judicial decrees examined, worthy citizens invited to co-operate. Not for a moment did Dr. Willson relax in his prolonged battle for clemency and justice, though there were multitudinous cares unceasingly pressing upon him. As late as 1863, at the conclusion of a renewed and detailed exposition of evidence and incidents bearing on his client's cause, he wrote:

> "I most earnestly and respectfully beg to state that I feel entire confidence as a matter of simple justice that John Murray's freedom will be at once granted him. He has now suffered eight years and three months' incarceration—ten months in Launceston jail, seven years and five months in penal servitude".

It was Christmas Eve, 1864. John Murray emerged from Port Arthur prison, a free man. Accompanied by the Catholic Chaplain, the Rev. Andrew Maguire, he walked over to the jetty to go aboard the boat leaving for Hobart. Bishop Willson's house in the city was open to offer him hospitality and welcome: there he knew a haven of peace

until the steamer *Tasmania* accepted him as a passenger. The wide ocean had become his friend, carrying him cheerfully away from the isle of frightening dreams and sad memories.[1]

Of interest is the story of Dr. Willson's association with the Irish Exiles of 1848, seven leaders of the Young Ireland Party transported to Van Diemen's Land as political prisoners: four for life; two for ten years each; and one for fourteen years.

It is quite certain that the Bishop, a thorough Englishman, disliked rebels intensely, especially rebels who saw no particular merit in English misrule and domination. There are in existence letters of his in which reference is made to "the wicked rebellion". But in this view of the patriotic resistance movement he is supported by many of the Irish clergy, at home and abroad. Writing to the Bishop of Hobart in reply to criticisms of articles appearing in the *Freeman's Journal,* a Sydney Catholic newspaper, the Rev. John McEncroe said: "I detest the wicked rebellion as much as you do". So Dr. Willson errs in the company of a distiguished Irishman and an intrepid missionary. But whatever his political leanings, he never ceased to manifest a real affection for the Exiles from the day of their arrival in his diocese until their liberation by organised flight or by royal condescension. The same can be affirmed of several of his priests, notably Fathers Dunne, Bond, Woolfrey, Butler, and Hogan. As three of the brilliant Irish group were Protestants—Smith O'Brien, Mitchel, and Martin—the Bishop did not come in contact with them as readily as with the members of his own flock. However, they all spoke and wrote of him as an esteemed friend.

On their arrival in Hobart the rebels were offered a ticket-of-leave. But they were obliged to submit to a restriction not imposed on others enjoying that concession: the Irishmen had to reside in separate Police Districts outside which none might go without the written permission of Sir William Denison. Patrick O'Donohoe, hoping to make his living as a solicitor, got permission to live in Hobart. At once the Bishop wrote offering the hospitality of his home. Although the Exile decided to lodge elsewhere, he always remembered with grateful feelings this unexpected gesture of friendliness. Never did Dr. Willson pass through Ross without calling on Thomas Francis Meagher, relegated to that area by order of the Lieutenant-Governor. And when the noble and soldierly patriot decided to take a Tasmanian lady for his wife, the Bishop of

[1]All details of case in the *"Willson Papers."*

Hobart made a journey of 56 miles to officiate at the Nuptial Mass celebrated at the residence of Dr. Edward Hall.

Three of the Irish Exiles suffered particularly severe punishment for a breach of the regulations. Secretly they had crossed their allotted boundaries to visit Smith O'Brien at New Norfolk. Not disposed to tolerate any disobedience to his orders, Sir William Denison sent the offenders to serve terms of hard labour at penal stations on Tasman's Peninsula. This severity aroused widespread indignation, expressed in press attacks on the Lieutenant-Governor and in demands for the immediate release of the prisoners. Amongst the appeals for leniency, the first to reach Government House came from Bishop Willson:

"Hobart Town, 2nd January, 1851.

"Sir,—I have the honour to solicit Your Excellency's humane attention towards Kevin O'Doherty and Terence McManus, who have forfeited their tickets-of-leave by absenting themselves from the Districts assigned them, without permission.

"I beg leave to assure Your Excellency that it is not my intention to offer any excuse for this infringement of a regulation to which they were subject; but to intercede for them now that they have been made sensible that they could not, with impunity, transgress regulations imposed upon them.

"I believe the moral character of both the prisoners since their arrival in this Colony will bear the most rigid investigation, a circumstance, I am sure, will be gratifying to Your Excellency, and one that I trust will plead most powerfully in their favour.

"The discipline of the Government having now been fully vindicated by their apprehension, sentence to punishment, and commencement of it, at a remote Penal Station, induces me to beseech Your Excellency earnestly and respectfully to extend to them at once your clemency, and remit that portion of suffering that otherwise awaits them. This act of merciful consideration would, I humbly trust, produce a more salutary effect upon their minds than the infliction of three months' labour and degradation; and also, no doubt, convince all men that, although you would not shrink when necessary from maintaining the regulations of the Government with firmness, that this firmness can be, when circumstances will permit, strongly tempered with mercy.

"I have the honour, etc.,

+ R. W. WILLSON,
Bishop of Hobart Town."

In making his mind known to the Bishop, as he did in a private communication, Sir William Denison wrote:

"You need never be in the least alarm of offending me by any appeal couched in terms of friendly advice or even remonstrance. I feel certain that you are actuated by a kindly feeling towards me, and shall always be grateful for any instances such as that with which you have this day favoured me. You will receive an official answer to your petition in the terms which I mentioned to you yesterday. I have no objection to O'Doherty, that is, I have no objection to promise a remission of two-thirds of his sentence, contingent upon his good conduct during the remaining third: but with regard to McManus, he has no claim to any indulgence. He was distinctly refused permission to leave his District and come to Hobart Town, and he has acted in direct defiance of the Government. He must, therefore, abide the penalty. I cannot allow any prisoner to

play fast and loose with the Government in this way: the example would be a most injurious one to the convict population generally.

"Believe me, I regret very much that I cannot comply with a request which I feel was made by you with a view not only to the benefit of the prisoners themselves, but also to mine".

Why was Patrick O'Donohoe's name omitted in the Bishop's petition? The fact is that severe illness had prevented his immediate removal. On recovery he was seized by police and sent to join a wood-carrying gang at Saltwater River. O'Donohoe had used the press to the annoyance of the Lieutenant-Governor and his representatives, so he could expect, even less than his colleagues, to escape harsh measures. Yet the Bishop, on February 6th, 1851, ventured to approach Sir William Denison "on behalf of Patrick O'Donohoe, now under punishment on Tasman's Peninsula". It was all in vain: the Lieutenant-Governor had made up his mind to keep McManus and O'Donohoe in chain gangs by day and behind bars by night for the full term of three months. Friends and sympathisers succeeded in rescuing McManus. In this conspiracy Bishop Willson had no part: he did, however, meet the fugitive at Ross on the very morning of Thomas Francis Meagher's wedding; and in giving a blessing he expressed the hope that nothing would arise to prevent the escape to San Francisco.[2]

In November, 1852, the Bishop was again interesting himself in those of the Exiles who were still in Sir William Denison's keeping, requesting His Excellency "to be pleased to permit Mr. Smith O'Brien and the other State prisoners to reside in any part of Van Diemen's Land they may select without being subject to the usual regulations referring to persons holding tickets-of-leave". This time it would appear that the Bishop's intercession did not prove unavailing. A little later Smith O'Brien went to Richmond as Father Dunne's guest: also in his letters he announces the intention of visiting several districts to thank numerous friends and well-wishers for their generosity to himself and to his comrades.

In 1853 John Mitchel got away, aided by Patrick J. Smythe, who had come to Van Diemen's Land from America, commissioned to take off one or more of the four Irish Exiles then held in the Colony. One year later Smythe returned to see what could be done to effect the release of Smith O'Brien, John Martin, and Kevin O'Doherty. Before plans had been fully worked out the Queen announced a pardon for the three political prisoners. It was during his visits to Hobart that Smythe be-

[2]McManus, Meagher, O'Donohoe and Mitchel escaped to America. The others were pardoned in 1854.

came acquainted with Jane Regan, daughter of Father Therry's benefactor and supporter in a glorious campaign for God against evil powers in Van Diemen's Land. In 1856 Smythe came back to claim his bride. Bishop Willson officiated at the marriage in St. Joseph's Church.

A member of the Young Ireland Party, but sentenced to death and then transported because of alleged association with Chartists in England, the artist, William Paul Dowling, frequently enjoyed the Bishop's company and hospitality. Samples of his work, paintings of Our Lady and Saint Joseph, done at Dr. Willson's request, may be seen in Hobart's oldest church. The best known portrait of the Bishop—the original now hangs in the Archbishop's House—is another of Dowling's pictures. He married in Hobart, Juliana de Veaux, descendant of a French family that had settled in Ireland at the beginning of the eighteenth century. On the day of the Baptism of their eldest daughter, Bishop Willson remarked that the child would one day consecrate her life to the cause of Catholic education. This she did as Sister Juliana Dowling in the Congregation founded by Father Julian Tennyson Woods.[3]

At every Penal Station the Bishop's influence made itself felt: his round of visits never ceased. "These visits," he says, "gave me an insight into the working of the system all over the Colony and afforded excellent opportunities for comparing the success of one station with another, and also of ascertaining what changes it would be judicious for the Government to make. I also considered it to be necessary to pay great attention to those unhappy men who fell into great crimes and who were condemned to forfeit life for their offences. By carrying out this plan I had ample means of becoming acquainted with what was taking place from the time a ship arrived in harbour with its freight of criminals to the time they became free or expiated an offence on the fatal scaffold". Due to Dr. Willson's frequent appearance in their midst and to the knowledge that he was ever advocating better conditions, prisoners of every denomination and status endeavoured to win his sympathy in their personal and individual grievances. Never did he refuse to give ear to an appeal: never did he act without having made careful investigation. Prayers for his merciful intercession poured in almost daily: favourable consideration to his suggestions followed an official respect for his prudent judgment.

Here we give a letter received from Douglas River Station: it throws light on several aspects of life in Van Diemen's Land:

"I know not how sufficiently to apologise for the liberty which, as a stranger,

[3]See O'Neill's *Julian Woods.*

I have taken of addressing you on the present, to me, most momentous occasion, in the hope that your well-known philanthropy, which has rendered your name familiar to the 'children of misfortune', may extend its influence to me in an act of merciful interference in my behalf.

"I am, indeed, Right Rev. Sir, painfully alive to the disadvantages under which I must necessarily appear as a candidate for your generous sympathy—permit me, however, to hope that your kindness may discover in the following narration somewhat to commiserate, however much you may condemn.

"I am the third son of the late R. F———, formerly of Worcester Park, in the County of Surrey, having one brother a member of the Bar, another a Physician, and the third a Clergyman. My aunt is Lady F———, and my uncle is B. F———, Banker, Southampton. I was myself educated at Eton College under the Rev. Thos. Cooksley, and subsequently became the pupil of Dr. Alex Delisser ..and in the Winter of '43 passed my examinations at the Hall, resolving to present myself at the ensuing session before the College of Surgeons for higher medical honours. My father's sudden death, however, placing me in possession of a large amount of ready capital, and my union a short time after with the daughter of the late Rev. Jno. Morton, determined me on immediately commencing practice, and, accordingly, I purchased the succession to an old established one in South Wales, where I continued respected by a large circle of friends for nearly four years. The extravagant habits, however, with which I had been brought up and the heavy claims of my wife's connections soon involved me in difficulties and ultimately led me to commit a forgery on my brother-in-law, Sir John B. W———, for a small amount to meet a pressing emergency, and my consequent expatriation from Home and all its beloved enjoyments. I must not, however, indulge in so painful a retrospect, but hasten at once to the circumstances more immediately affecting my present prospects.

"I arrived in this Colony per 'Rodney,' on board of which I performed the duties of Medical Assistant in a manner that called for the highest possible commendation from the Surgeon Superintendent, as expressed to the Governor, the Comptroller-General, and J. D. Balfe, Esq., and supported by the flattering certificates given to myself. On leaving the vessel I was induced to accept of the situation of Assistant to Dr. Smart, of Hobart Town, who on all occasions expressed the warmest approbation of my conduct and attainments up to the period when he gave me in custody to the police on 7th ult. (Feb., 1852) on the charge of misconduct, which he subsequently dropped and charged me with stealing a silver Lancet Case. I trust I need scarcely add I was acquitted on so unfounded a charge; but the charge of misconduct was again persisted in and I was sentenced to nine months' imprisonment. For all particulars connected with this case permit me to refer you to R. Wynn, Esq., Solicitor, Hobart Town, who, in a manner which must ever do credit to his heart, defended me throughout the whole of these unjust proceedings. That gentleman will, moreover, inform you of the high testimony borne to my character by J. D. Balfe, Esq., Assistant-Comptroller, and if on hearing the whole particulars you consider there is any merit in them, may I entreat your merciful intercession to procure me a mitigation of my fearful punishment. Had I no other grounds, however, on which to found an appeal for mercy, might I not urge the saving of the Surgeon Superintendant's life on the 4th October last, as detailed in his Journal of that day, and other important services rendered during the voyage and for which he exerted himself to procure the conditional pardon of myself and two more. There are, Rev. Sir, at this moment five or six gentlemen most anxious to engage my services, and that, too, at double the salary given me by my prosecutor, on whom and whose family I more than expended the paltry pittance he allowed me. I state not this with any feeling of acrimony or regret, as I am rendered in a measure independent by the kindness of my friends in England.

"In the earnest and prayerful hope that you may be induced to use your all

sufficient influence on my behalf, I have the honour to subscribe myself with every sentiment of respect and gratitude.

"A—— F——

"For the first time in my life I am compelled to associate with characters who for the most part are lost to every sense of rectitude and common decency. I cannot tell you how much this preys upon my mind, and at times I feel inclined to abandon myself to despair, as a lost man. In mercy save me! I will merit your recommendation".

* * * *

At the Queen's Orphan School, where children taken into custody by the Government were housed, at the Port Arthur prison, at the Female Factory, Bishop Willson fought the good fight for the best spiritual, social, and material conditions. The colonial archives, together with his own papers, reveal much that was hidden even from his contemporaries. But there is One Who knew and remembered. Can we not hear the Master saying to His faithful servant and shepherd: "Come, blessed of my Father, take possession of the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me to drink. I was a stranger and you took me in; naked and you covered me; sick and you visited me; I was in prison and you came to me . . . . Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me."

JOHN H. CULLEN.

(To be continued)

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

LISHEEN, by Canon Sheehan. London: Longmans. 12/3.

A great writer once declared that the man who had not read William Carleton did not know the Irish people. The same might be said with even greater truth of Canon Sheehan, whose genial personality, delightful humour, and intimate knowledge of Irish character are reflected in every page of his profoundly interesting novels, essays, and poems.

Time was, strange as it may seem, when Canon Sheehan received little of the applause and encouragement he so richly deserved, and when many among the Maynooth clergy looked askance at the priest turned author. But time has changed all that, and to-day his books are enjoyed by myriads of readers in almost every European language, who find in them not only pleasure and relaxation, but great works of literature, full of truths that are eternal.

Although not among the Canon's best novels, *Lisheen*, first published in 1907, possesses a charm and an enduring quality that will long ensure its popularity with the general reader. Written at a time when the Irish people were making a final stand against the old iniquitous system of land tenure, and intended as an exposure of the evils of landlordism, it is the story of a young landlord who goes to live incognito among the peasants in order to find out the truth for himself. The incidents portrayed are mostly authentic history with just a slight thread of fiction to connect the principal details of the story.

A kindly tone, sparkling wit, and the genuine story-writer's gift of narration combine to make *Lisheen* a book that will be always popular with old and young.

R.W.

Dogmatic Theology

THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS, IV.

THE ESSENCE OF THE MASS.

Two important questions now present themselves for our consideration. The first is this: in what part of the Mass is found *the essence* of the Eucharistic Sacrifice? And the answer is: the Sacrifice of the Mass consists essentially in the *double Consecration,* and in that action alone. The second spontaneously arises: what element in the Consecration is the formal constituent of the Mass as a sacrifice? In this chapter of our work we shall consider only the first question.

THE ESSENCE OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE IS FOUND IN THE DOUBLE CONSECRATION ALONE:—

This doctrine is held to-day as theologically certain, though there have been great theologians in the past who did not subscribe to it. Let us consider the reasons that have induced this universal conviction. We may argue by a process of elimination:

1) Speaking of *the victim* of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Council of Trent solemnly teaches that "one and the same Christ is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner, who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the Cross...The victim is one and the same".[1]

From these words it is certain that all the parts of the Mass which *precede the Consecration and follow the Communion* cannot possibly pertain to the essence of the Sacrifice. How could a sacrifice be essentially constituted before the victim is present or after the victim ceases to be present?

Similarly, when speaking of *the Priest* of the Eucharistic Sacrifice the Council teaches that "the same Christ now offers Himself, through the ministry of His priests, who then offered Himself on the Cross".[2] Christ, then, is the principal Priest of the Sacrifice. Thus Pope Pius XI, speaking of Christ's priestly office, recalls that He unceasingly exercizes that office in the Mass: "Christ, the priest, offered Himself (on the Cross) a victim for sin, and perpetually offers Himself".[3]

---

[1]Sess. 22, ch. 2; *Denzinger,* 940.

[2]*ibid*; cf. 4th Lateran Council: "Jesus Christ is at one and the same time priest and sacrifice" (i.e. victim); *Denzinger,* 430.

[3]Encycl. *Quas Primas, Denzinger,* 2195. Cf. *Catechism of the Council of Trent*: "The Priest is also one and the same, Christ the Lord". (Ch. 4, n. 77).

From this we gather that all the actions and prayers of the Mass that are found *between the Consecration and the Communion* do not belong to the essence of the Sacrifice, because they are not the actions and prayers of Christ the Priest but of the Church, and hence in case of necessity they may be omitted, the Sacrifice remaining essentially constituted. Thus there remain the Consecration and the Communion.

2) Proceeding further we find that *the Communion* must also be excluded from the essence of the Mass. It is true that a number of illustrious theologians who lived at the time of the Reformation, or in the sad years of doctrinal upheaval following that greatest disaster that has befallen Christendom, held that the essence of the Mass consisted almost equally in the Consecration and the Communion of the celebrant. Thus Dominic Soto, St. Robert Bellarmine, Lessius, Cardinal Lugo, The Salmanticenses, Tournely, and St. Alphonsus Ligouri, who, even in modern times, was not without some disciples (Marc, Aertnys, Hermann).[4] An opinion that attracted such a galaxy of theologians cannot be waved aside.

It would appear that two main reasons persuaded them to adopt it. Firstly, they were convinced not only that some form of immolation is essential to sacrifice, but that a *real, physical destruction of the victim is required.* In the Consecration, they said, the concept of *oblation* is sufficiently verified, but there is no evidence of real destruction. The latter, they argued, is found only in the Communion where the Eucharist is consumed. Therefore the essence of the Sacrifice is composed of these two parts of the Mass.[5]

Let us hear St. Bellarmine: *"In the consecration* of the Eucharist, three things take place which are required for a true, real sacrifice. Firstly, a profane thing is made sacred: for, the bread—an earthly and common thing—is changed into the Body of Christ, of all things the most sacred... Secondly, that thing, having been made sacred, is offered to God, when it is placed on the altar of God. For, to place a victim on the altar truly means offering it to God. Thus, because by virtue of the

---

[4]Soto: *Comment. in 4 Lib. Sent.*, t. 1, p. 559 (1569). Bellarmine: *Disp. de Controversiis Fidei,* De Missa, l. 5, c. 27. Lugo: *De Eucharistia,* Disp. 19, Sect. 5, n. 64—68. Salmanticenses: *De Eucharistia,* Disp. 13, Dubium 2, 3-5. S. Alphonsus: *Theol. Moralis,* l. 5, tract. 3, ch. 3, dub. 1.

[5]Cardinal Lugo says (*l.c.*) that this opinion was the one more commonly held by the theologians of his day: "Videtur esse sententia communior apud theologos". But the Salmanticenses, and St. Alphonsus state that the opinion of St. Thomas, which places the essence of the Mass in the consecration alone, was the more common doctrine. St. Alphonsus: "Sententia communior docet (essentiam Missae) consistere in sola consecratione". (*l. cit.*).

consecration the Body and Blood of Christ begin to be really present on the altar...it is clear that by the words of consecration a true and solemn oblation is made. Thirdly, by the consecration, the victim offered is directed to a true, real, external mutation and destruction; which is necessary for a true sacrifice. For, by the consecration the Body of Christ receives the form of food; but food is meant to be eaten, and so it is directed to mutation and destruction...

"Now, that *the Communion* is an essential part of the sacrifice is proved from the fact that in the whole of the Mass there is no other real destruction of the victim besides that which takes place in the Communion....

"It matters not that the Body of Christ does not suffer any hurt or injury in itself, nor that it does not lose its natural being when the Eucharist is eaten. It loses its sacramental being, and so it ceases to be really present on the altar; it ceases to be visible food".[6]

No one will deny that this is beautifully expressed. It is elegant and, at first sight, very attractive; it is a flash of the genius that was Bellarmine.

The second reason that moved these great theologians to embrace this opinion was their love and zeal for souls. One of the main reasons why the Protestants had rejected the Mass as a sacrifice lay in their contention that no sacrifice is possible without a real, *physical destruction* of the victim. They argued that since Christ, gloriously risen, can die no more, it is impossible for the Mass to be a true sacrifice. Undoubtedly, this stand influenced the Catholic theologians of the day, whose burning desire it was to close and heal the gaping wounds in Christ's Body, the Church. They endeavoured to show that there is indeed a real destruction of the victim of the Mass, and that consequently the Mass is a true sacrifice.

It is not difficult to see that the doctrine they proposed fell far short of the goal. Having posited the premise that "a true, real, external mutation and destruction" of the victim is an essential requisite for sacrifice, they could not escape the logical conclusion that, for the Mass to be a true sacrifice, Christ the victim must be *physically* immolated. But they defied the laws of logic, and arrived at *sacramental* destruction which leaves the victim completely untouched in its natural being. Thus the opinion failed in its purpose.

As far as we may judge, their premise was false. It is true, as

---

[6] *l. cit.* in note 4.

we endeavoured to point out in the preceding chapter, that immolation of the victim is an essential part of sacrifice. But it is also true that *the kind of immolation* necessarily depends on the nature and condition of the victim. Where the victim is present *sacramentally* one may logically conclude that the immolation will be *sacramental.* That is the only form of immolation possible. Hence, given that the Victim of the Mass is sacramentally present, under the external species of bread and wine, the only possible kind of immolation is that which strikes the Victim sacramentally. To seek a physical destruction of the Victim is to go outside the whole economy of the Eucharistic Presence of Christ, the sacramental Victim.[7] If the premise of those theologians were accepted, we should have to agree with the Reformers that the Mass is no sacrifice at all.

This opinion is now obsolete in the sense that no theologian, as far as we know, holds it any longer. But, by one of those strange reversals which occur from time to time in the life of the Church, it has manifested itself again in a practical way as a part of that grossly exaggerated "liturgical revival" which, in some parts of the world, has gone beyond all measure. Reliable sources of information have given us to understand that in some parts of the Continent and, to a lesser degree, in America and England, there are found those who maintain that the sacrifice of the Mass is not *essentially perfected* until the Sacred Victim has been consumed in Communion, and, indeed, not only by the Priest but by the faithful. And, what is worse, in some cases it is maintained that the laity should bring their own particles of bread to be consecrated and consumed in Communion in order that the Sacrifice be truly *their sacrifice*!

In view of these strange aberrations (and as a confirmation of their existence) we must heed the strong warning given by Pope Pius XII: "It is a false doctrine that would lead a priest to refuse to celebrate unless the faithful come to Communion; and it is still worse to ground this view—that the faithful must necessarily communicate together with the priest—on the sophistical contention that the Mass, besides being a sacrifice, is also the banquet of a community of the brethren; and that the general Communion of the faithful is to be regarded as the culminating point of the whole celebration".[8]

Continuing, the Sovereign Pontiff insists most emphatically on the theologically-certain doctrine that the essence of the Mass is found in

---

[7]cf. *A.C.R.,* April, 1951, p. 130 sq.
[8]Encycl. *Mediator Dei,* 20th Nov., 1947; C.T.S., Lond., p. 51.

the Consecration alone; and that "the Communion belongs to the *integration* of the Sacrifice", being a participation of the Victim sacrificed.

Theologians offer many reasons for excluding the Communion from the essence of the Mass. Firstly, the principal offerer of this Sacrifice is Christ, the High Priest. The ministers who offer the Sacrifice "consecrate the holy mysteries, *not in their own person, but in the person of Christ,* as the words of Consecration itself show; for the priest does not say: 'This is the body of Christ', but, 'This is my body'; and thus, acting in the Person of Christ the Lord, he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the true substance of His body and blood".[9]

From this it follows that only those parts of the Mass which are performed by Christ the Priest, or in the Person of Christ, constitute the essence of the Sacrifice. But the Communion is not performed by Christ nor in the Person of Christ, but in the priest's own person, as is clear from the words: "May the body of Our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul unto life everlasting". These words have a private, personal meaning, and indicate that the action is of a private, personal nature.

The Consecration alone is done in the Person of Christ, the High Priest. Therefore the Consecration alone constitutes the essence of the Sacrifice.

Secondly, Christ Our Lord first offered this holy Sacrifice at the Last Supper, as we saw in a previous chapter when discussing the sacrificial nature of the terms used by Christ on that occasion. It must be held, then, that the Sacrifice consists essentially in one or more of the actions performed by Christ and *narrated by the Evangelists.* It is unthinkable that the Evangelists should have omitted from their accounts of the institution of this supreme act of worship of the Christian religion all mention of that action in which the Sacrifice essentially consists. Yet, in those accounts there is no mention of Christ, the celebrant of the sacrifice, receiving Holy Communion; rather, the accounts give us to understand positively that He did not receive His own Body and Blood. Therefore, the Communion cannot pertain to the essence of the Sacrifice.

Furthermore, in the Gospel-narration of the first celebration of this Sacrifice no action apart from the Consecration could have constituted the Sacrifice. On the one hand, it is the great central fact that is related; on the other, the remaining actions, namely, the blessing,

[9] *Catechism of the Council of Trent,* ch. 4, n. 77.

giving-thanks, and breaking of the bread, preceded the Consecration, and therefore could not belong to the essence of the Sacrifice because of the absence of the Victim. Moreover, none of those actions has a sacrificial significance.

Thirdly, the true and proper signification of sacrifice, that is, the acknowledgement of God's infinite excellence and the testifying of one's total submission to Him, is entirely wanting in the Communion. Sacrifice is essentially an action of upward-mediation: the offering of something to God. The Communion, on the contrary, is essentially an action of downward-mediation: the receiving of something from God for one's own use and benefit.

Moreover, no destruction of the Victim is actually wrought in the Communion, but only the eventual corruption of the species of bread and wine, which in no way affects the Body and Blood of the Victim. It seems, then, that the Communion is in no way apt either to show forth the meaning of sacrifice or to enter into its physical constitution.

Fourthly, the Council of Trent teaches that the Mass is essentially representative of the bloody Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross: "Christ left to His beloved Spouse, the Church, a visible sacrifice, by which that bloody sacrifice once wrought on the cross should be represented, and by which its memory should remain until the end of time".[10] The Mass must necessarily represent, sacramentally, the physical separation of Christ's body and blood which took place on Calvary.[11] Now, this representation of the violent separation of Christ's body and blood is by no means verified in the Communion. Hence, theologians exclude that part of the Mass from the essence of the Scarifice.[12]

Finally, in all the sacrifices of the Old Law, as well as in the pagan sacrifices, the sacrificial banquet, or communion, was always considered as a participation in the sacrifice already constituted and completed, and as a means of sharing in the fruits of the sacrifice. Thus St. Paul, speaking of the Jewish sacrifices, says: "Are not they that eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?" (I Cor., 10, 18). The Apostle clearly

---

[10]Sess. 22, ch. 1; *Denzinger*, 938.

[11]*Ibid*: "Himself to be immolated under visible signs", i.e., under the species of bread and wine.

[12]This argument is not totally convincing. One could reply that the representation of Calvary's sacrifice is found in the Consecration where the sacramental separation of the body and blood recall their violent separation, (thus satisfying the Council's teaching), and yet hold that the Communion is required for the essence of the sacrifice on another score, as did the theologians quoted above. Thus, the argument must be considered together with the preceding ones, and in the light of their conclusions.

considers the sacrifice already essentially offered before the offerers partake of the victim. And he holds the same to be true of the Christian Sacrifice. (*ibid.*, v. 21).

St. Thomas, in his usual pointed style, went to the heart of the matter when he observed that the partaking of the Eucharistic Victim has regard to the Eucharist as a *sacrament,* whereas the oblation of the victim belongs to the sacrifice.[13]

Many other reasons could be advanced to justify the conclusion that the Communion must be excluded from the essence of the Christian Sacrifice, but those already mentioned amply illustrate the grounds for the common doctrine officially recognized and insisted on by the reigning Pontiff.

Now, if it is true that the Communion is not even *a part of the essence* of the Mass, a fortiori it is true that *the whole essence* of the Sacrifice does not consist in the Communion alone. This observation might seem altogether superfluous, but we make it in order to exclude the Banquet-Theory,[14] which has appeared again in recent times, and which cannot be tolerated. Such a view of the Mass is even incompatible with Dogma, because it is reduced ultimately to the contention that to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the same as communicating,—a doctrine condemned as heretical by the Council of Trent.[15] Such a position could be the logical resting-point of the extravagant theories against which Pope Pius XII warned us in the words quoted above.

The correct view, then, is that the essence of the Mass lies in the Consecration alone. The Fathers of the Church knew no other view. In the words of Consecration alone did they seek, and find, the sacrificial nature of the great Christian rite. And, indeed, if we look closely at that central part of the Mass, we shall readily see that it contains in a truly marvellous way all the elements of a true sacrifice. Therein is fulfilled that *most fundamental notion of sacrifice* which the very word itself implies: "to make a thing sacred"; to perform an action over an object, thereby setting it aside from all profane use, rendering it sacred in the eyes of God and men, and transferring it to God.[16] For, by the

---

[13]*S. Theol.*, 3, 79, 7, ad 3.

[14]J. Bellord strenuously defended it in 1905, cf. *The Ecclesiastical Review,* 1905, pp. 1-14; 258-273.

[15]Session 22, Can. 1; *Denzinger,* 948: "If anyone says that in the Mass there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice; or that 'to be offered' merely means that Christ is given us to be consumed, let him be anathema".

[16]Cf. preceding chapter, III; *A.C.R.*, April, p. 121 f.

words of Consecration the common and profane elements of bread and wine become the most sacred things outside of God,—the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ—and are thus transferred to God in a way that the mind of man could never have conceived. Therein *the Victim of Sacrifice is offered* to God in a true and solemn manner when the Body and Blood of Christ are made present and placed on the altar of God. Therein *the Victim is immolated* by the sword of the priest's tongue when the Body is sacramentally separated from the Blood under the separate species of bread and wine. Therein is *signified externally the great internal sacrifice* of Christ and the whole of His Mystical Body as they pour out upon the altar their hearts, minds, and wills, with all their affections, and life-movements. Therein man becomes one with his Heavenly Father, "adhering to God in holy fellowship".

THE DOUBLE CONSECRATION IS NECESSARY.

The Consecration of one species only is not sufficient for the Sacrifice. Both Consecrations are postulated for the essence of the Mass. A very brief analysis will be sufficient to demonstrate this point.

Firstly, Christ Our Lord commanded His Church to use essentially the same rite that He had used when instituting this Sacrifice: "Do this in memory of Me". But the essential sacrificial rite performed by Christ consisted in the twofold Consecration, as is clear from the sacrificial terms in each of the two Consecrations. Hence the double Consecration is demanded for the essence of this august Sacrifice. The Apostles carefully observed their Master's instructions and taught this truth to the faithful. Thus St. Paul warns us that *the renewal of Calvary's Sacrifice,* which is found in the Mass, is verified only in the consecration of both species: "As often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall shew forth the death of the Lord, until He come".[17]

Besides, is not the Christian Sacrifice the fulfilment of that prophetic sacrifice offered by Melchisedech? It must, then, correspond to its type and symbol, ordained by God. It must be offered in bread and wine: it must consist essentially in the twofold Consecration.

Secondly, the Council of Trent solemnly promulgated this doctrine in its magnificent Decree on the Mass: "Thus our God and Lord, at the Last Supper, showing Himself a Priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech, offered His Body and Blood to God the Father

[17] *I Cor.,* XI, 26; cf. X, 16.

under the species of bread and wine; and He commanded His Apostles, (whom He then constituted priests of the New Testament) and their successors in the priesthood, *to offer His Body and Blood under the species of those same things,* saying: 'Do this in memory of Me'. This the Church has always understood and taught".[18]

Thirdly, the Sacrifice of the Mass must, of its very nature, really and objectively represent the separation of Christ's Body and Blood which took place in His sacrificial death on the Cross. This is a dogma of our Faith.[19] Now, that violent separation certainly is not represented by the consecration of only one species, bread or wine. In virtue of the words: "This is my body", the Body of Christ is indicated to be present, but no indication is given of the state of death. In fact, the words of that single Consecration prescind from the state of life or death. On the other hand, a most vivid representation and recollection of Christ's death on Calvary is achieved when, and only when, the sacramental separation of the Body and Blood is wrought by the force of the twofold Consecration. Then indeed is Calvary's terrible drama clearly re-enacted on our altars, recalling to our minds the hour of our Redemption, so bitter, so sweet. We see on the altar the solid element of bread, over which are pronounced the sacred words: "This is my Body". We see there the liquid element of wine, which receives the words charged with God's power: "This is my Blood". Thus the Sacred Victim, insofar as He is sacramentally made present, and externally indicated to be present, under the separate species of bread and wine, is clearly shown to be in a state of death. Thus the Consecration impresses on our minds a striking image of that violent separation of our Redeemer's Body and Blood on the altar of the Cross.[20]

Finally, we saw when speaking of sacrifice in general that the formal constituent of sacrifice is found in the *immolation of the victim.*[21] Now, since it is a Dogma of the Faith that the Mass is a true sacrifice, and since, secondly, it is theologically certain that the essence of the Sacrifice is found in the Consecration alone, it follows that in the Consecration there is a true immolation of Christ, the Victim. We have further seen that this true, sacramental immolation is verified only in the

---

[18]Sess. 22, ch. 1; *Denzinger,* n. 938.

[19]*Ibid.*

[20]St. Thomas returns to this thought again and again when speaking of the double consecration. Cf. *S. Theol.,* 3, 74, 1; 3, 76, 2, ad. 1; 3, 83, 1; 3, 80, 12, ad 3; 3, 78, 3, ad. 2.

[21]*A.C.R.,* April, 1951, pp. 125 ff.

Consecration of *both species*. Therefore, we must conclude that the very element which formally constitutes the Mass a true sacrifice, namely immolation, demands the double Consecration. The Consecration of one species only may be said to be an *incomplete sacrament*, but it is certainly *no sacrifice*; though we may rightly say that the Consecration of the bread, which is de facto followed by the second Consecration, is *the beginning of the Sacrifice*.[22]

THE COMMUNION INTEGRATES THE SACRIFICE.

Although the Communion does not pertain to the essence of the Mass, it is held to be necessary for the integration of the Sacrifice. This has always been the mind of the Church. Thus the 12th Council of Toledo expressed grave concern over a local abuse of priests not receiving holy Communion as often as they celebrated on the one day: "It has been reported to us that some priests do not receive holy Communion at each of the sacrifices offered in one day...but only when they have offered the last sacrifice of the day; thus acting as though it is not considered necessary to partake of this true and unique Sacrifice as often as the immolation of the Body and Blood of Our Lord-Jesus Christ is wrought...What kind of sacrifice is that of which the sacrificer is not a partaker?"[23]

Moreover, the Council of Trent states that the custom of receiving Communion on the part of the celebrant has come down to us from Apostolic Tradition;[24] and the Church has always shown great concern in the matter of the consumption of the Sacred Species by the priest, even in extraordinary circumstances.

---

[22]Someone might say—as a couple of theologians (Tournely, Schell) once said—that the consecration of one species would seem sufficient to represent the sacrificial death of Christ on the Cross, because, by force of the words pronounced over the bread, the Body of Christ alone is immediately present under the appearances of bread, not the Blood; but where the Body alone is signified as present, we have a sufficient representation of death.—To this we must reply that it is one thing for the Blood *not to be signified* as present, but that it is quite a different thing for the Blood *to be signified as separated from the Body*. The latter must be verified for a true representation of Christ's violent death; and it is signified only by the double Consecration.

[23]Can. 5; Migne, *Patres Lat.*, v. 130, col. 556. Those words express many convictions entertained by either those reprimanded by the Council or by the Council itself, or by both. Firstly, it is clear that all concerned were convinced that the Communion does not belong to the essence of the Mass; secondly, the Council teaches that the Communion integrates the sacrifice offered; thirdly, the Council clearly suggests that the formal constituent of the sacrifice is found in the sacramental immolation of the Victim.

[24]Sess. 13, ch. 8; Denzinger, 881.

The intrinsic reason of this necessity lies in the fact that the Consecration places the Victim of the Sacrifice under the external form of food, namely, under the external species of bread and wine. Hence the Eucharistic Sacrifice is directed towards the consumption of the Victim as towards its connatural integration and external complement.

Who must partake of the Sacred Victim in order to impart this external perfection to the Sacrifice? It would seem that the Celebrant alone is capable of doing so. He alone gives us the Sacrifice in its essence and places the Victim on the altar in the form of food to be eaten. It is logical that he should integrate the Sacrifice which he essentially constituted. Moreover, since the essence of the Mass demands the Consecration of *both species,* as we have seen, it follows that the integration of the Sacrifice demands the consumption of the Victim under *both species.*

St. Thomas, with his inimitable clarity of perception, considers the matter thus: "Whoever offers a sacrifice must partake of the sacrifice, because the external sacrifice that is offered is a sign of the internal sacrifice in which one offers himself to God; and therefore, by his partaking of the sacrifice he shows that the sacrifice is his. Similarly when he dispenses the sacrifice to the people he shows that he is a dispenser of divine gifts, of which he, before all others, should partake; and so he should consume the Victim before he dispenses It to the people.... Therefore it is necessary that the priest, as often as he consecrates, should consume this sacrament under both species".[25]

Let none of us conclude from this that the faithful are not to be encouraged to receive the Divine Victim in Holy Communion. That would be a terrible error. Let us remember that this august Sacrifice is the Sacrifice of the whole Mystical Body, the supreme means by which the great, undivided society of the Church is made one with God. Hence, by every means in our power we should urge all the faithful to communicate at every Sacrifice of the Mass that they co-offer with the priest. It is truly their sacrifice, and they share in it most intimately when they receive into their souls the Sacred Victim of their redemption and perennial sanctification.

Pope Pius XII, in his timely Encyclical *Mediator Dei,* solemnly confirms and seals the doctrine we have outlined in this chapter: "It must be emphasized again and again that the Eucharistic Sacrifice, of its

[25] *S. Theol.,* 3, 82, 4.

very nature, is the unbloody immolation of the Divine Victim which is made evident in a mystic (sacramental) way by the separation of the sacred species and the offering of them to the Eternal Father. The Communion belongs to the integration of the Sacrifice; it is a participation of the Sacrifice by the reception of the Blessed Sacrament. And, while it is quite necessary for the sacrificing minister, to the faithful it is only to be supremely recommended".[26]

He who thinks with Peter, thinks rightly.

THOMAS MULDOON.

---

[26]November, 1947.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

THE FAITH OF THE ROMAN CHURCH, C. C. Martindale. Sheed and Ward, 1950. (English price, 7/6.)

This book is a reprinting of the original work of the same title published by Methuen in 1927 in a series called "The Faiths". The old title has been retained that there may be less likelihood of anyone taking it for a wholly new book. As the title implies, the book is a short compendium of dogmatic theology, its shortness may be estimated from its well-spaced 130 pages. Little more than thesis headings, you say! The book may be conveniently considered in two parts, first an attempt to indicate the intellectual substratum of the Faith (which is both stimulating and satisfying), and then a brief, muscular, almost geometrical, outline of Catholic doctrine. This section reveals the active realistic mind of the author. Perhaps we may be permitted an example. Striving to clarify this dogma—God freely willed to give to human nature a life that was superhuman, the difficulty is precisely to make people realise that we mean something substantial and real by the Supernatural Life. They insist that it means "living holily or heroically, if not spookily". The passage which follows thereupon makes the notion of Supernatural Life quite lucid. Martindale's vocabulary and modes of expression will no doubt appeal to the "intellectually" minded, e.g., the fruition of Supernatural Life is "inhibited" here on earth, eternity is the "fixation" of Grace. He speaks of "crisis" Sacraments, which are Baptism, Confirmation, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. Two short corollaries bring the book to a close. One depicts the foundation of the Church by Christ (with unhurrying haste) in the world of Caesar and the Stoics, and its growth to the present day, "with its quaint new cults and its vague philanthropic idealism which is debauching the intelligence and even the will".—Church History in eleven pages. The second shows the Church in action in the world to-day, with its saints and its sinners, and its average members moving "with imperceptible oscillations in a tiny area of ordinariness". It is conveniently indexed, and should prove useful to put into the hands of an inquirer who is looking for more than the Sunday sermon.

T.O'N.

Moral Theology

ABSOLUTION FROM RESERVED CASES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In the course of parochial visitation, the Curate of a Parish meets a couple who went through the form of marriage in a Registry Office. Finding them in good dispositions, he arranges to have the union regularised by proper canonical marriage. He sees to all the formalities and, as one of the parties is a non-Catholic, obtains a Dispensation from the Bishop. Prior to the ceremony, the Catholic approaches the sacrament of Penance. As the Curate hears the confession, he remembers that the sin of attempted marriage before a civil official is reserved by the Plenary Council to the Ordinary. The marriage ceremony, which is to take place immediately after the confession, cannot well be postponed. Could absolution be given directly from any other sins which may have been confessed and the reserved sin thus remitted indirectly?

Would you kindly discuss in the *Record* the principles which govern the absolution from reserved sins, and indicate:

1. Was the absolution given by the curate valid?
2. Would the case have been the same had the couple attempted marriage before a non-Catholic minister?

VICARIUS.

REPLY.

The absolution given by the curate was valid and the sin of attempted marriage before a civil official was remitted directly, as this is an instance where reservation of *sins* ceases. Had the couple attempted marriage before a non-Catholic minister, the confessor would have had to deal with a reserved *censure,* namely excommunication reserved by Law to the Ordinary. The absolution from both censure and sin would have likewise been valid; but if we prescind from special delegation which is granted rather generously to Priests in many Dioceses of Australia, there would remain an obligation of subsequent recourse to the Ordinary in connection with the excommunication from which absolution has been given. The reasons for these statements will appear as we proceed.

The meaning of reservation is best gathered from the terms of can. 893 of the Code, where it is described as the withdrawal of certain cases to the tribunal of the superior, with a consequent limitation of the power of absolution enjoyed by the inferior. A similar practice obtains in the

civil courts, some charges of a lesser kind being heard and decided by a magistrate in summary jurisdiction, while the more serious infringements of law are dealt with by a higher official or supreme court judge. The Council of Trent (D.921) has pronounced *anathema* against those who affirm that the Bishops have not the right to reserve cases to themselves, except as a matter of external administration, and that the reservation of cases does not hinder a priest from absolving from them. In chapter VII of the fourteenth session, the Decree of Trent reads as follows: "To our most holy Fathers it seemed a matter of great importance to the discipline of the Christian people, that certain more atrocious and grave crimes should be absolved not by all, but only by the highest priests". After asserting the authority of the sovereign pontiffs to reserve to their exclusive judgment certain more grave cases, the Decree continues: "And since all things that are from God are well ordered, it is not to be doubted that the same may lawfully be done by all bishops, each in his own diocese, unto edification however, not unto destruction, in virtue of the authority over their subjects that is given to them above other priests inferior in rank. It is in accord with divine authority that this reservation of crimes should have effect not only in external administration but also in the sight of God". From a consideration of the decree of the Council of Trent and of the Canon of the Code (893), we conclude that reservation means that the Superior has brought the case to his own tribunal, and consequently the inferior judge is not competent to sit in judgment on it. We also conclude that the purpose of reservation is the good ordering of discipline among Christian peoples—the public good—by the more authoritative judgment of the higher superior; and is not the punishment of the individual delinquent. There is no doubt that his correction is aimed at with a view to restoring good discipline, and this, too, can be more efficaciously secured by the attention of the superior who, by reason of his experience as well as authority, is better equipped to apply a remedy, especially one which will have a more beneficial effect on the community at large. Further, the difficulty of obtaining absolution will frequently deter the faithful, when tempted to commit a sin which they know cannot be absolved by any and every confessor.

The jurisdiction to hear confessions may be limited with regard to persons, and in fact the usual faculty given to confessors excludes religious women. Again, the jurisdiction may be granted merely for certain places or given only for a definite time. Just as the Superior who grants the jurisdiction is not bound to make it available for all persons always

and everywhere in his territory, so he may judge it advisable to restrict it with regard to certain sins: and this he does when he "reserves" a case. Consequently, the reservation directly affects and limits the jurisdiction of the confessor and only indirectly touches the penitent, who is thus under the necessity of seeking a privileged confessor, a priest who has the faculty to absolve from the sin of which he is unfortunately guilty. Should a confessor who has not faculties for reserved cases grant absolution, the good faith of the penitent may prevent the sacrament from being invalid, but the reserved sin is not directly remitted and there remains *per se* an obligation to confess it again to a confessor who is empowered to grant absolution from reserved cases.

The Superior who has ordinary jurisdiction to grant faculties for confessions may reserve cases to himself (cf. Can. 893). Absolutely speaking, he may make a reserved case of any sin; but since the purpose of reservation, as we have seen, is to promote Christian discipline, unto edification and not destruction, he is forbidden to reserve any but a few, three or at most four external and more grievous sins, and then only for a period necessary to restore the standard of morality among his flock. The Law also requires that the reservation be effected after discussion in the Diocesan Synod, or, if on another occasion, after consultation with the Cathedral Chapter (Diocesan Consultors) and some of the most experienced Pastors of the Diocese. In order that the reservation may produce its good effects in the community, steps should be taken to acquaint the people that a certain offence is reserved, and faculties to absolve from such cases should not be given to all and every Confessor. On the other hand, it must not be made practically impossible for the unfortunates who are guilty of reserved sins to obtain absolution; and so the Vicars Forane should have faculties to deal with them, with the power in places distant from the Episcopal residence, to sub-delegate this faculty in particular cases to the priests of their district. Furthermore, during the time for the fulfilment of the paschal precept, when experience shows many careless persons are accustomed to receive the Sacraments, all parish priests may absolve from cases which the Ordinary has reserved to himself; and during a mission the missioners enjoy the same faculty.

Can a confessor who has not the faculty, either habitually or for a particular instance, to absolve from a reserved case, ever give absolution to a penitent who accuses himself of a sin which is reserved? He can directly absolve from reserved sins in the circumstances enumerated in can. 900. These are:—

a) When the penitent is a sick person, confined to his house. The Church is always indulgent towards the sick, and in consideration of the great difficulty such a person would have in arranging for a special confessor, all reservation loses its force in his case.

b) When an intended bride or bridegroom goes to confession in preparation for the reception of the sacrament of Matrimony. Frequently enough this confession is made not long before the marriage ceremony and it would not always be convenient in the time available to find a privileged confessor. Also, it will be granted, this is an occasion when every choice of confessor should be afforded to the betrothed couple to make a sincere confession of their past faults in preparation for the new state they are about to enter.

c) If the legitimate Superior is asked to grant faculties for the absolution of reserved sin in a particular case and refuses it, the reservation ceases. This may at first sight seem strange: that a favour is obtained by its refusal. However, the purpose of the reservation has been achieved and the case has been brought before the knowledge of the Superior, whose duty it was to make it possible for the repentant sinner to return to God and not to repel him.

d) Reservation ceases when in the prudent judgment of the confessor, the faculty for absolution cannot be requested from the legitimate Superior without grave inconvenience to the penitent, or without danger of violation of the seal of confession. If there is ground to fear that the seal may be broken, as the Superior or any other person could come to know who the penitent was who had confessed the reserved sin, the obligation of asking for the faculty ceases, and the confessor has it from Law. When it would be a grave inconvenience for the penitent to remain in the state of sin until such time as the faculty is sought and obtained from the Superior, the reservation likewise ceases; otherwise we would have an example of reservation productive of evil rather than good. This last provision of Law makes it easier for the ordinary confessor to absolve from reserved cases, as often enough he will find that absolution deferred would mean that the penitent is put to grave inconvenience and possible danger of loss of reputation.

e) Finally, reservation ceases outside the territory of the Superior who made the reservation, even though the penitent went away merely to obtain absolution. This is a conclusion from the principle that the reservation affects the confessor and only indirectly the penitent. If the confessor in the Diocese where the confession is made has faculties to absolve from the sins which are told him, he can give absolution.

It is enough that the judge who actually passes the sentence of absolution is competent to do so, and the validity of his act is in no way affected by limitations placed on confessors in other Dioceses.

To return to the question submitted by VICARIUS. The sin confessed, attempted marriage before a civil registrar, is reserved without censure to the Ordinary by the Plenary Council (Dec. n. 411). If it were an Episcopal case, that is one reserved *by* the Odrinary, there could be no doubt that the reservation ceased when the man was making his confession prior to marriage. The same seems true also for the reservation imposed by the Plenary Council. The Pontificial Commission for the Interpretation of the Code gave an answer (10th Nov., 1925, *A.A.S.* XVIII, p. 583) that the words of Can. 900, *quaevis reservatio omni vi caret* apply to the sin reserved *ratione sui* to the Holy See (can. 894), and we see no reason why they should not also be applicable to a sin reserved by the Plenary Council. The decrees of the Council would lead to the same conclusion. In dec. n. 412 the Fathers expressly include the sin mentioned in the preceding decree (attempted marriage before a civil Official) among those from which absolution may be given, in virtue of can. 899, p. 3, by Parish Priests during the Paschal time. It is reasonable to deduce that they meant to include it also in the phrase *quaelibet reservatio peccati omni vi caret* with which they begin the next decree (413), wherein are enumerated the occasions on which reservation ceases. Amongst these occasions is the one which concerns us now: *Cum confessionem paragunt...sponsi matrimonii ineundi causa.*

The Curate who heard the confession of the man about to be married could absolve him directly from all his sins, even those which are reserved. Reservation loses its force in such circumstances. The fact that the person was already civilly married does not enter into consideration; the ceremony he is about to take part in is his marriage, and so he is entitled to the privileges of those who go to confession *matrimonii ineundi causa.*

Before concluding this section, it may be well to remark that there is no need in the present legislation on Reservation to have recourse to giving absolution directly from other sins confessed and indirectly from those which are reserved. (This, by the way, would leave the penitent under the obligation of confessing his reserved sin again and receiving direct absolution from it on another occasion). Whenever it would be a grave inconvenience for the penitent to remain without absolution till such time as recourse may be had to the Superior for the necessary faculty, the reservation does not apply and a simple confessor may

absolve from the sin. It goes without saying that he should give a suitable penance and prudent advice; but once the absolution is given, there is an end to the matter and the penitent has no further obligations, except to perform his penance.

2. Had the couple in question entered their union by the form of marriage before a non-Catholic clergyman, in his official capacity as a minister of Religion—and it is hard to conceive him celebrating a marriage in this country in any other capacity—the Catholic party would have incurred the *ipso facto* excommunication laid down in can. 2319, p. 1, reserved by Law to the Ordinary. An excommunicated person is forbidden to receive the Sacraments (Can. 2261, p. 1), and so the Confessor is forbidden to administer to him the Sacrament of Penance, until he is first absolved from his censure. It is true that excommunication of itself does not deprive the confessor of his jurisdiction to absolve from the sin, *qua peccatum*, but because of the censure he is forbidden *sub grave* to use his power, and moreover should the excommunication be reserved the sin which it punishes is also reserved (Can. 2246, p. 3.). This particular excommunication is reserved by the Code to the Ordinary, who may delegate any confessor to absolve from it. In many dioceses the Bishops have given faculties to their Priests: *Absolvendi ab omnibus censuris in Codice J.C. Ordinario reservatis.* If the priest who hears the confession has such a faculty, he uses it to absolve from the excommunication and then he absolves from the sin, which, once the excommunication has been removed, is no longer reserved. The usual formula of absolution contains an absolution from censures: *te absolvo ab omni vinculo excommunicationis . . . in quantum possum et tu indiges.* Whenever the priest who absolved from the censure had the faculty to do so from the delegation of his Bishop, there are usually no further formalities to be observed. Absolution given in the Sacrament of Confession is, of course, in the internal forum and does not free a person from the obligation of observing the censure externally, should the Superior so desire, until he shall have obtained absolution capable of proof in the external forum. But in most cases the fact that the man has recommenced the practice of his religion and has had his matrimonial union validated will be sufficient to give rise to the presumption that he has also been absolved from his censure.

If the confessor has not the faculty to absolve from the excommunication reserved by Law to the Ordinary, we have the circumstances verified for the *casus urgentior* of can. 2254. The confessor can absolve

from the censure and consequently from the sin, but he must warn the penitent of the obligation of having recourse within a month, and under pain of a similar excommunication, to the Ordinary, to receive suitable instructions and admonitions. If he prefers, the penitent may in the meantime re-submit his case in confession to a priest who has the necessary faculties, and he will then be freed of the obligation of recourse to the Bishop.

* * * *

SINS OF "DIVORCED" PERSONS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Does a sin against the sixth commandment committed by a "divorced" person with a third person, include the "note" of adultery.

P.C.S.

REPLY.

Since our Correspondent has placed the word "divorced" in quotation marks, we conclude that he uses the term to designate those who are validly married, but have secured a decree of dissolution in the civil courts. It is not within the competency of the civil courts to grant anything more than freedom from certain civil effects and obligations consequent upon the marriage contract. The marriage bond itself is indissoluble by divine ordinance, and so called civil divorce does not alter the true matrimonial status of the parties. They still have the exclusive rights over each other with regard to all that concerns the generation of offspring. Hence any sexual indulgence with a third person is a violation of the marriage contract and of the virtue of justice as well as of chastity. It includes the "note" of adultery.

* * * *

BAPTISM OF CHILDREN WHO WILL NOT ATTEND CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is it lawful to baptise the child of parents, both Catholics or one a non-Catholic, who deliberately refuse, without reason, to send their older children already baptised to the Catholic school?

Western Priest.

REPLY.

Baptism could not be refused to a child of Catholic parents or of a mixed marriage, merely because it is foreseen that the child, through the fault of the parents, will not be sent to the Catholic school. All that is required with regard to the future upbringing of the child is a prudent hope that he or she will be educated or reared as a Catholic. Unless the

Catholic parents have lapsed into apostasy or heresy or schism, the mere fact that they ask to have their child baptised is sufficient indication that they intend to bring him up in the true Church. If they had given up all practice of their religion, without becoming formal apostates, and their older children were already being reared in ignorance of all religion, the parish priest may have reason to doubt the prudence of baptising the child. But if in response to his admonition they promised to mend their ways, he should, we think, administer the sacrament of Baptism. Attendance at a Catholic school is an important element in Catholic education; and to send children to another school is to run the risk of their perversion, a risk not to be undertaken without sufficient and grave reason according to the decision of the Bishop. If parents deliberately and without reason send their children to the neutral schools provided by the State, they are doubtless guilty of sin. This, however, does not imply that they have become apostates and that their children, in regard to the sacrament of Baptism, are to be treated in much the same way as the offspring of non-Catholics. Further, while it is important that children should be educated in a Catholic school, it is not impossible to rear them as Catholics should they frequent another school. The fact that they will be sent to a State school does not necessarily mean that they will be brought up as members of a heretical sect or without any religion at all, even though it must be admitted that they are missing a very valuable aid to Christian education and that the task of the parents is rendered more difficult. At any rate, it is safe to say that all hope of their being reared as Catholics has not disappeared because of their probable or even certain attendance at a State school; and we think a priest would not be justified in refusing baptism to the child of Catholic parents unless they refuse to bring him up as a Catholic. The fact that Catholics present their child for Baptism creates a presumption that they intend to bring him up as a Catholic—perhaps not as a Saint should be reared nor even with all the instruction a zealous priest would like to have them give him, but as a Catholic all the same.

JAMES MADDEN.

Canon Law

1. NEW SETTLERS AND NATIONAL CHAPLAINS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

(1) What is the position of New Australians in regard to marriage? What practical rules would you suggest that National Chaplains might observe in ministering the Sacrament of Matrimony to their nationals?

(2) Are these people to be regarded as "Vagi", and, if so, is recourse to the Ordinary necessary in every case of marriage? When and how do they cease to become "Vagi"? Would you regard a person living in a Camp as possessing a Diocesan or Parochial domicile?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

New Australians are subjects of a local Ordinary and of a Parish Priest by reason of domicile, quasi-domicile, or actual residence. Therefore, National Chaplains should have the requisite authority from Ordinary or Parish Priest in order to administer the Sacraments, validly and lawfully, according to the Canons. This is of particular importance in the case of marriage, because the power of Ordinaries and of Parish Priests to delegate another priest to assist at a marriage is restricted by the Code. All *general* delegations to perform marriages are excluded by Canon 1096, 1, except for Curates for the parish to which they are assigned. Apart from this exception, authority to assist at a marriage must be given to a certain definite priest, with a view to his assisting at a certain definite marriage.

Pre-Nuptial Investigation.

The Parish Priest whose office it is to assist at a marriage shall, a suitable time beforehand, carry out a careful investigation to determine whether there is any obstacle to the celebration of the marriage. He may depute another priest to carry out this investigation. National Chaplains should have the authority of the Parish Priest of a party to a marriage in order to perform this pre-nuptial inquiry. It would appear to be a reasonable arrangement for Ordinaries and Parish Priests to agree to a National Chaplain's presuming the required authority in order to commence this investigation when parties intending to marry approach him. In the course of his inquiries the Parish Priest may find it necessary to seek a dispensation from some matrimonial impediment, or from banns, as the case may require. The National Chaplain who

carries out a pre-nuptial investigation may be authorised by the Parish Priest to make necessary preparations for seeking such dispensation. For example, in the case of mixed religion he may give the necessary instructions and have the written guarantees signed by the parties. Again, it would seem a practical and reasonable arrangement that National Chaplains should presume the required permission in order to make these arrangements.

In the course of these inquiries it will be found that many new settlers are unable to produce documentary proof of baptism, and of confirmation. In fact, a reasonable doubt as to their freedom to marry may arise from the very absence of documentary identification. In this case the rule of Canon 1031, 1, applies: "If a doubt has arisen regarding the existence of some impediment the Pastor shall investigate the matter more thoroughly by questioning at least two trustworthy witnesses under oath, unless the impediment is one which, if known, would injure the good reputation of the parties, and, if necessary, he shall also question the parties themselves in the same way". The pre-nuptial inquiry forms in common use make provision for such sworn statements to be obtained.

Celebration of the Marriage.

In order to celebrate the marriage validly and lawfully the National Chaplain must have the necessary delegation from the Pastor of the place of marriage. Of course, if a National Chaplain has been appointed as a Curate in a certain parish, then he may have a general delegation to assist at marriages in that parish. A general delegation given in any other circumstances is invalid and marriages performed in virtue of such a delegation are invalid. To celebrate the marriage lawfully in a parish other than the proper parish of one of the parties, the Chaplain must have the permission of the proper Pastor.

According to Canon 1097, 2, the Parish Priest is responsible for making the appropriate entries in the Register of Marriages. It is particularly desirable that there should be co-operation between the Pastor and the National Chaplain in order to ensure accuracy in this respect.

It may not be out of place to recall a canonical result of failure to observe the laws concerning lawful assistance at a marriage. "A pastor who assists at a marriage without the permission required by law may not take the stole fees for himself, but must remit them to the proper pastor of the parties" (Canon 1097, 3).

(2) It is not possible to give a general reply to this query. It will be necessary to apply the canonical norms concerning domicile and quasi-

domicile in the individual cases. It may be taken for granted that New Settlers are to be classified as "Vagi" when they arrive, having left their residence in Europe without any intention of returning. No doubt the query envisages particularly those who take up residence in camps and is taking into account that many are under contract to work wherever they are sent by the authorities. In spite of these circumstances they may acquire at least a quasi-domicile, either parochial or diocesan. The law of the Code has simplified considerably the situation concerning quasi-domicile, as it admits actual residence in a place for the greater part of a year as sufficient to establish claim to a quasi-domicile. Even before the lapse of this period it would be possible for a New Settler to have the intention requisite to acquire a quasi-domicile, in the same way as Government employees, like policemen. A judgment as to whether, in a given case, it is possible to form such an intention would be based upon the practice prevailing in the administration of the Government Department in question. Sometimes it would be an established custom to leave an employee in one place for a certain minimum period.

It should be observed, at this juncture, that a pastor assists at a marriage lawfully when one of the contracting parties (ordinarily, the bride) has a domicile or quasi-domicile in his parish or has resided there for a month.

Canon 1032 states the law concerning assistance at marriages of "Vagi": "Except in case of necessity the pastor should never assist at the marriage of persons who are "Vagi", as described in Canon 91, unless after referring the matter to the Local Ordinary, or to a priest delegated by him, he has obtained permission to assist".

The Congregation of the Sacraments in 1921 issued an Instruction concerning marriages of immigrants from Europe: "Parish Priests must remember that some immigrants are to be considered as vagi, at whose marriage the parish priest must not assist before obtaining due permission from the Bishop (Canon 1032). And even in the case of those immigrants who are not vagi it is difficult to ascertain with certainty that no impediment exists, and in these instances, also, the parish priest must not assist at their marriages without consulting the Ordinary (Canon 1031, 1023). For these reasons, therefore, the Sacred Congregation commands that parish priests must not assist at such marriages as are dealt with in this Instruction, without consulting the Bishop, except in the extreme case of danger of death".

It would seem that an Ordinary might carry out this Instruction suitably by deputing the pastor of a parish in which a camp is situated

to examine all such proposed marriages on his behalf, giving the pastor any appropriate directions on which to base his judgment.

* * * *

II. TRADING FORBIDDEN TO CLERICS AND RELIGIOUS—ANOTHER QUERY.

A priest lends money to a friend to establish a business, without any security or any legal title to ownership of the business. There is, however, an understanding that if it succeeds, the priest will receive a portion of the profits. Is the priest subject to censure?

H.B.

REPLY.

The investment described is not forbidden by the recent Decree concerning trading. It is on a par with holding debenture shares (obligations), which is admitted universally to be outside the ban. The holder of debenture shares is a creditor of an organisation, not a member. Lending one's possessions fruitfully is an instance of ordinary administration, called "negotiatio economica" by Canonists.

* * * *

III. DISPENSATION FROM MIXED RELIGION—GUARANTEES OMITTED.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Several years ago Father Temerarius, while on visitation of his Mission District, met an elderly couple who had been living together for a number of years, but had never been married in the presence of a Priest. One of the parties was a Catholic, the other a Protestant. Father Temerarius found on inquiry that both parties were willing to have the marriage rectified then and there. He had Missionary faculties to dispense from all Major and Minor impediments of Ecclesiastical law. Anxious to settle the case immediately, because the Catholic party was about to enter hospital, he promptly put the parties through the ceremony in the presence of two witnesses, omitting, however, to demand the necessary promises.

He did not form any precise intention of removing any particular impediment, but, knowing that he had the faculties to dispense, he proceeded with the ceremony. After returning home he wrote out a "Dispensatio Mixtae Religionis et Disparitas Cultus ad Cautelam" and forwarded the form to Diocesan Chancery.

Father Temerarius later departed for another mission field. His successor now wishes to know:

1. Was the marriage performed by Father Temerarius invalid because of his failure to demand the promises?

2. Was the Dispensation invalid because of defect of specified intention?

3. If the marriage is invalid, is it advisable to leave the parties in good faith?

AREOPAGUS.

REPLY.

1. Undoubtedly, the dispensation granted by Father Temerarius was invalid if the necessary guarantees were not obtained. This is clear from the exacting terms of Canon 1060: "The Church does not dispense from the impediment of mixed religion, unless, etc...." Furthermore, to put the matter beyond all doubt, there is a decree of the Holy Office issued in 1932, stating explicitly that a dispensation from mixed religion, or from disparity of cult, is invalid, unless the guarantees are obtained as required by law.

However, it is possible that the Missionary obtained the promises *orally* from the elderly couple. The fact that on his return he filled out a form to be despatched to the Chancery would indicate that he considered that he had carried out all that was required of him. Also, it should be noted that for the validity of a dispensation it is sufficient that the guarantees are given *implicitly*. "Although the Holy See has from time immemorial required, and now strictly requires, that in all mixed marriages the fulfilment of the conditions be safeguarded by a formal promise explicitly demanded and given by both parties (Canons 1061 and 1071), still the use of the faculty to dispense, whether it be ordinary or delegated, cannot be called invalid if both parties at least implicitly gave the guarantee; that is, if they placed acts from which it must be concluded and can be proved in the external forum that they were conscious of their duty to fulfil the conditions and that they manifested a firm purpose to perform that duty". Therefore, if the Missionary had explained to the parties the requirements of Canon Law in this respect, and then had forgotten to obtain from them explicitly the required guarantees, it would appear that their ready co-operation in renewing their consent would indicate that implicitly they were giving the guarantees as explained by him previously.

In regard to the question as to whether the marriage was invalidated by his failure to obtain promises, it should be recalled that the impediment of mixed religion is an impeding impediment. Therefore, unless there was reason to consider that the Protestant party was unbaptised

so that the impediment of disparity of cult was present between those parties, it should be concluded that the marriage is valid.

If the husband's Baptism remains doubtful, the presumption of the law is in favour of the validity of the marriage (i.e., the convalidation), according to the principle enuntiated in Canon 1070, 2. "If a party at the time of the marriage was commonly regarded as baptized, or if his or her baptism was doubtful, the marriage must be regarded as valid according to Canon 1014, until it is certainly established that one of the parties was baptized and the other was not".

2. Concerning the intention to dispense elicited by the Missionary, it may be concluded reasonably that the dispensation was not invalid on this score. He was fully conscious that there was an impediment of mixed religion to be removed before the union was convalidated. Also, he was quite conscious that he possessed the necessary faculty for granting that dispensation. His intention was to rectify the marriage using whatever faculties were required in order to achieve that purpose. Implicitly, at least, his intention was to dispense from the impediment.

3. The ordinary method of remedying the situation when a marriage is invalid is to effect its convalidation. In the present case, if it is decided that the marriage is invalid, it should be possible to achieve this objective by means of a Sanatio in radice. On the one hand, it appears likely that the necessary conditions for it being rightfully applied are verified—perseverence of a naturally valid consent, presence of an impediment of ecclesiastical law (disparity of cult), and moral certainty as to the absence of danger of perversion to the Catholic party and of danger to the Catholic Baptism and Catholic upbringing of the offspring either born or to be born of the union. On the other hand, in view of the obvious inconveniences entailed in requiring the parties to renew their consent, it is just the situation for which the Sanatio is intended to provide. If a Sanatio is inapplicable, it would seem the prudent course to leave the parties in good faith.

* * * *

IV. COMMUNITY CHAPELS IN CAMPS FOR NEW SETTLERS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In some of the camps where New Settlers are housed there is what we might call a Community Chapel in which Mass is said by visiting Chaplains. It is also used by other Ministers of religion, to conduct religious services. This institution represents a great advantage for the

Catholics in the camp, especially when the camp is at a considerable distance from the parish church. Results prove that a much higher percentage attend Mass in these circumstances, than if they are required to travel some little distance to the parochial church. Is there any canonical prohibition against the use of such a Community Chapel?

CHAPLAIN.

REPLY.

There is no canonical reason for objecting to the practice outlined in this query. True enough, there is the prohibition of Canon 823-1: "It is not permissible to celebrate Mass in the Church of Heretics or Schismatics, even though this was formerly rightly consecrated or blessed". But this prohibition really does not bear upon the present situation. There is no question of dealing with a building which is dedicated to heretical worship. Therefore, if the place is suitable for the celebration of the Mass on other scores, and if no scandal is caused by the practice in question, it may be taken for granted that the Community Chapel may be used without any scruple. In the circumstances of a New Settlers camp, where accommodation is of the emergency type, it may be taken for granted that there is no fear of scandal.

There is an instruction of the Holy Office, quoted in the Fontes of the Code, which bears out this solution. The query was proposed in reference to a military establishment in which there was a building used for both Catholic and heretical worship. In the building were two altars, one Catholic, the other heretical, and while the Mass was in progress the heretical altar was curtained off and vice versa. The reply of the Holy Office was to the effect that every effort should be made to obtain a building exclusively for the use of Catholic worship, but if this could not be done the building could be used in the manner described, provided that scandal was removed.

* * * *

V. EUCHARISTIC FAST. RENEWAL OF FACULTY TO DISPENSE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A few years ago our Ordinaries received a new faculty to dispense from the law of Eucharistic fast. In a recent issue of the *Record* certain queries were discussed in reference to this faculty. Now, I understand, the faculty has been renewed with some modification. For the enlightenment of those who have been empowered to exercise the

faculty in question, will you kindly explain the nature of the changes introduced?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

It will be recalled that four classes of persons benefit by this faculty. Of particular interest is the fourth class, namely, those who attend the sick at night time. Although any relaxation of the law would be welcome to these people in some circumstances, nevertheless, the faculty as framed originally was somewhat unsatisfactory and left certain doubts as to its correct interpretation. In the new form the terms of the faculty are much clearer. At the same time they are in some respects more exacting.

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

Beatissime Pater

Ordinarii ditionum Novae Zelandiae et Australiae, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provoluti, humiliter facultatem petunt dispensandi a lege jejunii eucharistici infirmos in nosocomiis degentes, fideles sexagenarios adversa valetudine laborantes, mulieres praegnantes et lactantes et personas ex officio et gravi cum incommodo in servando jejunio pernoctantes in assistentia infirmorum.

Et Deus....

Sacra Congregatio do Propaganda Fide, vigore facultatum sibi a SS. mo Domino Nostro Pio Div. Prov. Papa XII tributarum, benigne adnuit pro gratia juxta preces, ita ut omnes fideles, de quibus supra, Sanctam Communionem accipere possint post abstinentiam horarum quatuor a cibis solidis, horae unius a potionibus et medicinis (alcoholicis tamen potionibus inde a media nocte exclusis) et infirmis in nosocomiis degentibus necessariam medicinam sumere liceat etiam ultima hora ante ipsam Sanctam Communionem, remota quacumque scandali et admirationis occasione et servatis ceteris animae et corporis dispositionibus.

Praesentibus valituris ad quinquennium.

In the first place the terms of the dispensation are much more liberal than in the original form. The power to dispense from Eucharistic fast was only to the extent of taking drink or medicine; now, for all four classes named the extent of the dispensation is that, they may receive Holy Communion after abstaining for four hours from solid food, for one hour from drink or medicine, while alcoholic drink must be excluded right from midnight. In the case of those who are sick in

hospital there is a further concession to the effect that they may take necessary medicine even during the last hour before Holy Communion. It will be observed readily that the new faculty is much more helpful to those who are on night duty in hospital, because it makes provision for them to have a full meal at some time after midnight, which generally is more convenient for hospital routine.

Furthermore, the more recent faculty makes no restriction in regard to the number of times in the week on which the faculty may be exercised, so that a person dispensed in accordance with the terms of the faculty could receive Holy Communion daily. In its original form the dispensation could be used to allow Holy Communion to be received three times in the week. The more liberal concession is of particular interest to nursing sisters who are accustomed to assist at daily Mass and receive Holy Communion even after being on night duty.

In determining who are eligible for the dispensation by reason of their assisting the sick at night time, it is necessary to apply somewhat stricter rules than formerly. In the original formula, the dispensation was applicable to "Attendants of the sick, provided that it is a question of assistance by night and that a grave inconvenience is involved in observing the fast". In its present form the faculty is applicable to—"Persons who by reason of their duty or service (ex officio) spend the night (Pernoctantes) in attending the sick and who experience a grave inconvenience in observing the fast". The term "Pernoctantes" would appear to exclude those whose attention to the sick is more of a casual nature, e.g.—the Doctor or Nurse or other attendant who is called during the night to attend the sick, and who must spend an hour or two in that occupation. Further, the term "Ex officio" appears to be somewhat restricted, making the favour applicable only to those whom obligation, professional or otherwise, binds to the service of the sick by night.

JAMES CARROLL.

Liturgy

MOVING OF CHALICE VEIL—CUSTOMS AGAINST RUBRICS—MANNER OF ASSISTING AT MASS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In the January, 1951, issue of the *A.C.R.* a question is answered about moving the chalice veil at Mass (page 72), in which it is stated "there is no need for the server to change the position of the veil, etc". I think the Rubrics of the Missal explicitly state that the Celebrant takes the veil "A dextris", which would be impossible if the server has placed it on the LEFT hand side. Note that the Rubrics do not say "dextra" which is the case when he takes the burse to replace it on the chalice after the ablutions.

The reply further states:—"Nevertheless the practice could no doubt be justified by custom in this country".

Is there not a Decree or Instruction stating that no custom, however ancient, may prevail against the Rubrics of the Missal? If this be true the custom of standing during the Credo would be out of order. Do not the Rubrics say that those assisting at Mass KNEEL for the whole of Mass except at the two Gospels? Sitting during the Notices and Sermon would not be forbidden as they are not regarded as part of the Mass.

PASTOR.

REPLY.

The rubrics of the Missal in regard to the rearrangement of the Chalice after the ablutions are not as explicit as our correspondent suggests. The *Ritus servandus* (x, 5) simply states: 'plicato corporali, quod reponit in Bursam, cooperit Calicem Velo, et Bursam desuper ponit, et collocat in medio Altaris, ut in principio Missae'.

The position of the Veil cannot be deduced from this rubric. The *Ritus* (xi, I) does instruct the server to move the Missal to the Epistle side of the altar, but it does not mention anything about the Veil. Menghini observes, in a footnote, that some move the Veil to the Gospel side and he says that the practice can be admitted, however, he also adds that the Missal should be moved first so that the Veil can be unfolded and handed to the Celebrant or placed upon the altar (cfr. *Le SS. Ceremonie,* 4a ediz., Roma 1921, p. 148). Many authors maintain that it is permissible for the server to fold the Chalice Veil at the Offertory after the Celebrant has uncovered the Chalice, although the

rubrics give no such direction. Consequently the practice of moving the Chalice Veil to the Gospel side after the ablutions certainly does not seem to be contrary to any rubric.

The second point raised by PASTOR is that of the effect of custom upon the rubrics of the Missal. It was a common opinion among rubricians before the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law that no custom contrary to the rubrics or the Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites could be legitimate, unless it was specifically approved by the Holy See. Since the Code, however, this opinion is generally rejected, because the Code recognises that custom can prevail against ecclesiastical law in certain circumstances (Can. 27). Commentators now generally admit that these same conditions apply to liturgical laws. In the decrees issued at various times by the Congregation of Rites certain customs contrary to the rubrics have been approved, e.g., not lighting the Elevation candle, the Subdeacon not going up to the Altar to recite the *Sanctus* with the Celebrant and Deacon at a High Mass. It is true that it is difficult to admit custom against the rubrics because the Holy See has frequently expressed its desire for uniformity and its disapproval of contrary usuages, and in some instances has reprobated such usuages. For example, Canon 818 directs the celebrant at Mass to carefully observe all the rubrics of the liturgical books and not to add any ceremonies or prayers of his own choosing, and at the same time the canon reprobates all contrary custom. This canon refers to the Celebrant and so the reprobation does not extend to the rubrics which concern the server, or the congregation, hence custom may still prevail against these rubrics, and this, indeed, is the case in Australia in regard to the manner of assisting at Mass as described in the Decrees of the Second Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand (Appendix X). After quoting the rubric of the Missal: 'All assisting at Low Mass kneel the whole time except during the Gospel', the instruction continues: 'This is the direction of the Missal (Rub. gen. tit. xvii, n. 2). But it has been modified by custom as follows:—

1. When the Priest enters the Sanctuary, all rise as a mark of respect. They kneel when the Priest begins Mass or (at the principal Mass on Sundays and Holidays) the prayers before Mass, and remain kneeling till the Gospel.

2. All stand during the Gospel and Creed genuflecting at the *Et incarnatus est*; and after the *Dominus vobiscum* they may sit until the *Sanctus*.

3. At the Sanctus, when the bell is rung for the first time, all kneel

and continue to kneel until after the Communion of both Priest and people. When the Priest receives the first ablution, they may sit; but they kneel again when he goes to the Missal.

4. After the blessing, all rise and stand during the last Gospel. At the words *Et verbum caro factum est* they genuflect. After the Gospel they kneel during the prayers after Mass'.

* * * *

ORATIO SUPER POPULUM

Dear Rev. Sir,

Referring to the *Oratio super populum* appearing in the ferial Masses during Lent:

a. Is it obligatory in private Masses?

b. Is there any movement of the hands to be made when beginning 'Oremus'. 'Humiliate....' Any movement of the head? Bow?

c. What is the position of the hands during the recital of the prayer itself?

d. What is the origin and significance of this prayer?

PERPLEXUS.

REPLY.

The *Oratio super populum* must be said in all ferial Masses, as the rubric makes no distinction (*Ritus servandus* xi, 2).

Rubricians do not agree in their interpretation of the directions which the above rubric gives for the actions which accompany the recitation of the prayer. Martinucci directs the Celebrant to recite the *Oremus* as before the prayers, namely opening and joining the hands while bowing to the Crucifix. Then, with hands joined and head bowed to the Missal, he says: *Humiliate capita vestra Deo,* and extending his hands before his breast in the usual fashion he recites the prayer. Other writers, Gavantus, Menghini, O'Connell, prescribe only one bow, towards the Crucifix, while the Celebrant opens and joins his hands and says: *Oremus. Humiliate capita vestra Deo,* after which he continues with hands extended as above.

The Leonine Sacramentary, which is the most ancient of the Roman sacramentaries, dating from the 6th-7th century, contains more than 160 formulae indentifiable as prayers 'super populum', although they do not actually bear that title. These prayers possess certain characteristic features proper to them, and which distinguish them from the other prayers such as the collect, secret, and postcommunion. The

last-mentioned prayers are prayers of the whole community and recited in the name of the community by the celebrant. The celebrant associates himself with those on whose behalf he is making the petition. On the contrary, in those prayers which are commonly termed 'blessings', the celebrant does not generally asociate himself with those for whom he intercedes, but rather, as mediator between God and men, he beseeches God to send His blessings upon men. It is this structure that characterises the prayers 'super populum' found in the Leonine Sacramentary. In origin, then, these prayers were a final benediction invoking upon the faithful the divine protection and an abundance of heavenly favours, both spiritual and temporal. In the Sacramentaries of the 8th century, however, the above characteristics are wanting in many instances, but the title 'super populum' appears. The number of prayers, too, was greatly reduced until, at the time of St. Gregory the Great, they are found only on the ferias of Lent. The precise reason for these changes is not known. Some have suggested that by virtue of its introductory formula the prayer was understood to have a penitential character, while others think that the postcommunion came to be looked upon as the final blessing, thus rendering the prayer 'super populum' an unnecessary duplication. Whatever be the true historical explanation of these developments, such is the arrangement still retained in our present Missal. Seventeen of the thirty-six prayers 'super populum' contained in the Missal differ in no way, in form, from the collects of the Missal, but in the light of the development outlined the significance of these prayers can be readily understood.

* * * *

SOME SUGGESTED REFORMS OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY.

Pope Pius X declared in 1913 that the reform of the Psalter which He introduced was but the first step in a reform of the Divine Office. This reform was to embrace both the calendar and the various elements of the Office, especially the lessons. During recent years a number of articles have appeared in periodicals setting out different ways in which the reform might be effected. One point on which there is general agreement amongst writers is the necessity of shortening the office in order that it might become more attractive and fruitful for the members of the secular clergy engaged in the pastoral ministry. Needless to say, the proposed reforms differ a good deal from one another, but Abbot

Salmon, of the Monastery of St. Jerome, Rome, has summarized the principal projects (L'Ami du clergé, 23 Nov., 1950) and some indication of the suggestions may be of interest to readers of the *A.C.R.*

The Psalter. The Office is a prayer of praise and consequently all agree that the psalter will always be its basic element. Some writers think that it might be advisable to extend the recitation of the entire psalter over the period of a fortnight instead of a week, but others point out that the actual determination of such an arrangement presents many difficulties, and so many maintain that other means may be found of shortening the office, while still retaining the weekly recitation of the 150 psalms. Many would limit the number of feasts which require the setting aside of the weekly schema of the psalter.

The Lessons. As for the lessons taken from Sacred Scripture, most writers are anxious to see a more judicious selection of readings, which takes account of the liturgical seasons and makes better use of the treasures of both the Old and New Testaments. It has been suggested that the scriptural lessons might be replaced by the obligation of ten minutes reading of the Scriptures. The need for a revision of the lessons of the second nocturn is recognised by all. Historical inaccuracies could be corrected and legendary data reduced to a minimum, and when retained, its true character could be indicated. Abbot Salmon observes that the historical lessons could well be curtailed as much as possible with a view to eliminating the likelihood of the necessity of further revisions afterwards because of the discovery of later historical information. Moreover, he adds, that, because of the improved scholastic training of clerical students, the priests of to-day are more well-informed than many of their predecessors, and their need of information not so great.

The writings of the Fathers are voluminous enough to allow a richer selection of homilies than we have at present. Apropos of these lessons Abbot Salmon remarks that it should be borne in mind that they are not intended to give a theoretical and systematic exposition of doctrine, but their purpose is to place us in the atmosphere of the feast being celebrated and to help us to meditate upon it.

In regard to the other elements of the Divine Office, namely, the antiphons, responsories, hymns, etc., some are in favour of their suppression, but others suggest less radical modifications.

Turning next to some suggestions for the different Canonical Hours.

Matins. One writer proposes that Matins could be given an

entirely new character. It would become a form of spiritual reading, made up mainly of lengthened lessons from Scripture, to be read from the Bible itself, except when travelling. In this scheme there would be only three psalms. Other suggestions are less revolutionary and retain the weekly division of the psalter of Pius X, while allowing for some minor modifications, to be achieved, in large measure, by revising the rank of many feasts.

Lauds and Vespers. Most projects do not require any substantial alterations in the present form of these two Hours. There are suggestions for the limitation of the *preces* and *suffragia,* and for the abolition of the second schema of psalms at Lauds.

Prime. In the opinion of some the *Quicumque* should not be used so frequently, while others would prefer to see it replace the psalms in the Sunday Office. Another suggestion is that that part of the Hour which follows the prayer should be reserved for recitation in choir, and so in private recitation the Hour would terminate before the *Pretiosa.*

Small Hours. With the exception of those who favour the abolition of hymns and antiphons, most writers would allow these Hours to remain unaltered.

The Calendar. Any reform of the Breviary must take account of the liturgical calendar made up of the annual cycle of seasons in which are celebrated the mysteries of the life of Christ our Redeemer. It is desired that greater emphasis be placed upon the Temporal cycle, so for instance many wish to see the ferias of Advent, Lent, and Eastertide declared privileged ferias, which can be displaced by only a very few feasts. Writers are almost unanimous in their opinion that it is not possible to give to the different feasts the same grade of solemnity that they now have. Some think that the feasts of many saints should be reduced to simple rite, unless there be some special reason for greater solemnity, such as the birthplace of the saint, or the place of his tomb. The more solemn feasts alone would have an office of nine lessons. It has been suggested that the practice of the *memoria* in use in the monastic rites since 1918 could be extended to the Roman Breviary. In this system the *memoria* of a saint is made by adding an historical lesson to the Matins of the ferial office, together with a commemoration in the 1st Vespers. The pre-eminence of the temporal cycle could be thus preserved in the universal calendar, and it could be left to the discretion of the Ordinary to decide if a feast should enjoy a more solemn office in the local calendar.

There are those who think that there still remains another way of

accommodating the Office to the changed conditions of parochial life without altering any of the traditional elements of the Office, and this by a revision of the obligation of the Office in private recitation. These writers are anxious to see a greater insistance placed upon the observance of the liturgical Hours, consequently they suggest a prohibition against uniting several Hours, and the determination of a *tempus utile* for the recitation of certain Hours. They suggest the following distribution: Vespers between 3 p.m. and midnight; Matins between 6 p.m. and noon of the following day; and Lauds between dawn and midday. Because of the monastic origin of the small Hours it does not seem possible to determine a suitable time for their recitation. The obligation *sub gravi* would be limited to Matins, Lauds, and Vespers in private recitation, and the other Hours would be placed in the same category as the spiritual exercises enjoined by Canon 125, § 2. The practice of reciting the Small Hours passed only gradually from the monks to the secular clergy, and when they were eventually adopted by the latter it was for public recitation by clerics attached to some church. There was at that time no question of reciting them in private. In the present day, when the secular clergy live alone and recite the Office privately, it is scarcely possible for them, in the midst of the obligations of their pastoral ministry, to observe the canonical Hours and so usually the Small Hours are united. In such circumstances, the sense and value of this practice becomes doubtful, and it is suggested that it would be better to leave these Hours optional for private devotion. According to this plan, the clergy would be obliged to divide the recitation of their office, with the passing of the *tempus utile* the obligation would cease, but, at the same time, the practice of the primitive Church of consecrating the day by morning and evening prayer would be maintained.

It need scarcely be added that all writers in making these suggestions acknowledge that there is but one source from which any alteration or modification of our present Roman Breviary can come, namely, the Supreme Head of the Church. Moreover, the motive that has prompted these suggestions is that a means might be found of enabling the clergy to derive greater benefits from the daily recitation of the Office. It is a question of so adapting the prayer of the Office to the souls of to-day that it may unite them more fully to the mysteries of Christ, and fill them with a profound sense of God and His Presence, which will enlighten and strengthen them in their daily lives.

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

THE PRESENCE OF GOD.

What chiefly distinguishes the saints from ourselves is their vivid sense of the presence of God.

We are apt to think of God as remote from ourselves: we pray to Him as from an immense distance, envisaging Him as enthroned in the impenetrable majesty of a far-away heaven; or, if we think of Him as dwelling amongst us, we think usually of the Blessed Sacrament, restricting His presence to certain places, where we may indeed visit Him, but where we do not constantly live. And yet the plain truth is, as we learned in the Catechism, that God is everywhere.

The immensity of the essence of God pervades all space and permeates all being. God is in everything or more truly, all things are in God. "In Him we live and move and have our being". And that presence of God in all things is not, as it were, a passive thing, as if things and God existed side by side but independently. Created things exist because God continually supports them in existence: that same creative power which brought the world into being is continually exerted to prevent its slipping back into the nothingness from which it came. He holds us all in the hollow of His Hand.

We depend upon God not only for the continuing fact of our existence, but for every activity of that existence: not only our being, but our doing flows from the presence of God within us. When our mind and will enter into consultation and determine on a course of action, God is present at the conference: on His resources we rely to carry our decision into effect. God is, as it were, the dynamo which supplies the electric energy that activates the complicated mechanism of our nature. We cannot raise our arms save by the power of God.

The presence of God within us, tremendous enough even in the natural order of things, is raised to a new level of intensity through sanctifying grace. The soul in grace is elevated to a plane of existence above its natural level of being: in this super-natural life it is united intimately with its creator: in some mysterious way, it becomes fused into the divine essence. "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me" said St. Paul, and Our Lord Himself said with grand and beautiful simplicity: "If any one love Me, he will keep My word, and My Father will love him, and We will come to him, and will make our abode with him".

It was their acute perception of these truths that enabled the saints to live here on earth a life of union with God. Sin was abhorrent to them, for they understood it for what it is, an outrage against the present majesty of God, an infidelity to our heavenly lover perpetrated before His very eyes, an impious and unnatural perversion seeking to be raised in the arms of our Father that we might be able to spit in His Face.

From this thought, too, they found their unshakable confidence in doing good. We are all only too well aware of human weakness, we are overawed by the powers of darkness, we are conscious of our lack of spiritual stamina, we despair of our ineffectual efforts to accomplish anything worth-while. But, with St. Paul, the saints gloried in their infirmities that the strength of Christ might be the more clearly manifested in them. They knew that with the Spirit of God animating them they could call upon limitless resources, and summon up inexhaustible reinforcements. "I can do all things" said the Apostle, "in Him that strengtheneth me, the Lord".

This, then, was the secret of the saints: they lived in the presence of God. This was their defence against evil, their strength in virtue. It was, too, their consolation in suffering, their comfort in adversity. They were never alone, though the whole world was against them; and no matter how fierce the storm about them their souls dwelt in peace, a peace that the world cannot give, and which the world cannot take away.

How can we imperfect Christians cultivate this sense of the presence of God? The answer is, of course, through prayer: habitual prayer, prayer not restricted to set times and places, not confined to set formulas or precise wording, but prayer which is—what prayer is essentially—conversation with God. If we can cultivate the habit of constantly raising our thoughts and hearts to Him, if we include Him in our work and play, our joys and trials, by ever and anon whispering an "aside" to Him, the whole stream of our conscious life will become permeated with the thought of Him: we shall live our lives in His presence. And when we come at last to face Him at the judgment, we shall encounter not an aloof stranger, but a familiar friend.

W. H. BAKER.

Notes

BURCHARD'S *LIBER NOTARUM*

The name of Burchard is one very well known to readers of Renaissance history. Pastor's pages from Sixtus IV to Julius II are peppered with references to the celebrated papal Master of Ceremonies, as are those of Gregorovius, Rodocanachi, Symonds, Creighton, and the others who treat of the same exciting period. The reader is tantalized because it is with difficulty that one can obtain the *Liber Notarum,* or, *Journal,* as it is commonly called. Portions of the *Journal* had been printed by Leibnitz and Gennarelli among others, but the first complete edition was that of L. Thuasne in three volumes at Paris (1883-1885). Even if you had Thuasne's edition, you soon found out that E. Celani's *Johannis Burckardi liber notarum ab anno* 1483, *usque ad a.* 1506 (Città di Castello, 1906-1911, 2 volumes, 4°) was the most authentic text, enriched moreover with copious notes and printed in sumptuous style for the critical edition of Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores,* of which collection it is Volume XXXII. Celani's edition is rare even in large libraries, and Thuasne's three volumes are very hard to consult, not to speak of trying to buy. In 1932 the first French translation of Burchard's *Journal* appeared.[1] It was, of course, only a selection made by the notorious Joseph Turmel (*alias* Coulange, *alias* Delafosse, *alias* Dulac, *alias* Perrin, *alias etc., etc.*). Turmel said in his introduction that Celani's edition was for the ordinary reader practically impossible to consult, as there were not more than ten copies in France! The fortunate discovery in a Sydney second-hand bookshop of a large number of uncut parts of the *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* brought Celani's edition of Burchard into the possession of the present writer at a low cost. What manner of man was Burchard?[2]

---

[1] *Le Journal de Jean Burchard,* by J. Turmel, Paris, 1932. Turmel gives references to both Celani and Thuasne. Turmel, the excommunicated Modernist priest, has translated fairly, but to pack all the purple patches into one book of 415 pages gives a false impression of Burchard's book as a whole.

[2] This is the form of the name by which he is generally referred to, for instance by Pastor. The spelling in reality would be *Burckard.* On the life of Burchard Celani and, in particular, Thuasne give many details. See, also *Dict. d'Histoire et Géographie Ecclésiastiques,* tome 10, *S.V.*; *Dict. Arch. Lit. Chrét,* Tome 2, part 1, *S.V.* (many curious blunders, e.g., Burchard's death which it places in 1503); F. *Gregorovius, Rome in the Middle Ages,* (*Trans.* A. Hamilton), London (1909), Vol. VII, Part II, pp. 634-636; Lord Acton, *Historical Essays and Studies,* London, 1907 (The Borgias and their latest historian), pp. 65-84 for the period; J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy,* vol. I, New York, 1935 (Modern Library), p. 195, 212-214. Symonds wrote before the full edition of Burchard was published,

He was a native of Nieder-Haslach in Alsace, born about 1445 to 1450. In 1467, he was at Strasburg, employed by a member of the Cathedral Chapter. In that same year, in November, 1467, he arrived in Rome to seek his fortune. He was engaged by two cardinals and employed in very humble work. From childhood he had had a passionate interest in the sacred liturgy, to the study of which he applied himself with intense labour. Noticed by Sixtus IV, his career opened before him. He obtained several benefices in Alsace; he was named prothonotary in 1481; in 1483, Sixtus IV made him master of ceremonies in the papal chapel in succession to Agostino Patrizzi. Burchard began his duties on January 26, 1484, and continued them until death removed him on May 16, 1506, under Julius II. He had been made bishop of Orta and Civita Castellana by Julius II in 1504, but he had remained the supreme ruler of the Sixtine Chapel until his death, to the understandable chagrin of his assistants, in particular of the waspish Paris de Grassis, his eventual successor, both as Master of Ceremonies and diary writer. Burchard, thus, lived through the reigns of Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, Pius III, and died during the early years of Julius II. His whole working life was spent in the Sixtine Chapel, which he always refers to as the Great Chapel, never using the term 'Sixtine'. He superintended the funerals of four popes; he attended and directed the ceremonies of four conclaves; he witnessed the resignation of the cardinalate by Caesar Borgia; he was in charge of the ceremonies when the same Caesar became Captain General of the Church; he rode out from Rome to conduct the victorious Charles VIII, King of France, with due ceremony to the Pope; he was in Rome that terrible night of the Duke of Gandia's murder; with Alexander VI he drew up the Ceremonial for the Holy Year of 1500, a ceremonial, so it is said, which was the model for the ceremonies of future Holy Years; he was in charge of countless important and complicated papal functions; every dreadful contretemps which a Master of Ceremonies could dream of happened in fact to Burchard, who nevertheless did his work in the dry impassive way that is almost inhuman;[3] finally almost the last note in his *Journal*

---

and the sections placed in his work from Infessura had been eliminated; short note with good bibliography in the new *Enciclopaedia Cattolica,* vol. III, Rome, 1949, col. 224-225; F. Gregorovius, *Lucrezia Borgia,* London, 1948 (Phaidon), has much interesting information, but he is not strictly critical; M. Creighton, *A History of the Papacy,* London, 1903, vol. IV, pp. 388-340; E. Rodocanachi, *Une Cour princière au Vatican...*(1471-1503), Paris, 1925, is a mine of information; Pastor, *History of the Popes,* vol. VI..

[3]On one occasion, an assistant priest collapsed during a solemn mass. Burchard had the helpless assistant priest removed from the altar, but not before the

describes the laying of the foundation stone of the new glorious St. Peter's by Julius II, a ceremony which he directed with his liturgical genius. He was an ardent worker in his profession. With Patrizzi, he prepared the first edition of the Roman Pontifical in 1485. Further in 1502 he printed at Rome the first *Ordo servandus per sacerdotem in celebratione missae,* which in 1524 was inserted at the beginning of missals.[4] He lived at a time which thrills all of us with its mighty expansion of human activity. He moved about Rome in the age of Raphael, Michelangelo, Columbus, Caesar and Lucrezia Borgia, of Savonarola, Erasmus, Charles VIII, Louis XII, and Julius II. He built a house in Rome in the German style that was unique, remnants of which have survived to our day, and he has given his name to a street in the Eternal City, the *Via di Torre Argentina,* and to a famous Roman theatre, the *Argentina,* in which the *Barber of Seville* had its first exciting performance.[5] So the dry Alsatian prelate has won for himself a niche in liturgical history, and a mention, too, in the history of the gorgeous period of the Renaissance.

He also kept a diary. That is why the grave historian Pastor and the slimy Turmel both have turned their attention to Burchard. History and infamous gossip are both to be found in the *Liber Notarum,*

---

master of ceremonies had taken the cope from him and assumed his office with great smoothness. Charles VIII of France attended a great papal mass, and kept up a series of questions to Burchard about the meaning of the ceremonies: "ego declaravi singula sibi melius quo potui, et post singulas...declarationes meas, rex replicavit *pur que?*...non cessavit repetere *pur que?*...non potui sibi semper satisfacere" (20 January, 1495).

[4]On Burchard's work concerning the rubrics of the Mass, see Dom Guéranger, *Institutions Liturgiques,* vol. 1, Paris, 1840, p. 386-387, who gives the wrong date, 1503, for Burchard's death. He was copied by the writer in the *Dict. Arch. Chrét. Lit.* of Leclercq.

[5]Celani gives a long note on the *Via di Torre Argentina,* drawn from D. Gnoli, *La Torre Argentina in Roma* (Nuova Antologia, June 16, 1908). The origin of the name of the street and the theatre was doubtful for a long time, but Celani is certain that the name comes from the house in the German style that Burchard built; Burchard was from the diocese of Strasburg, *diocesis argentinensis, episcopus argentinensis,* or, *argentinus.* Celani, *op. Cit.,* vol. II, note 7, p. 347. See also the *Enciclopedia Cattolica,* Rome, 1949, vol. III, s.v., *Burcardo, G.,* which quotes Gnoli. This identification is common now in popular guide books, for instance, *Guida D'Italia* (*Italia Centrale*) *del Touring Club Italiano,* Milan, 1925, p. 307. The *Via de Torre Argentina* runs from the Pantheon towards the river, joining *Via Arenula,* which leads to the *Ponte Garibaldi.* Celani gives a long account of the remnants of Burchard's house, as does also the *Guida D'Italia.* Celani cannot help exclaiming how ironical it is that while many saints, scholars and artists have lived in Rome, not all of them have had as much honour, as Burchard—*il rozzo cerimoniere passa trionfante alla posterità col grosso latino de' suoi diari e s'affaccia ora, dopo quattro secoli, a rivendicare, dall'alto della sua torre, il nome della via e del teatro!*

with history, however, the predominant part by far. This work of Burchard, of "an almost fabulous celebrity", as Gregorovius says, is not to be thought of as a rival for those of a Procopius, a Greville or a Bulow. Burchard began his *Journal* seemingly as a help towards his liturgical profession. Day by day, he notes the papal ceremonies, interesting liturgical problems of precedence and that perennial and, to the uninitiated, baffling problem of the commemorations at mass. He seems to have had only a practical purpose in view, particularly in the early part of his work. The reigns of Sixtus IV and Innocent VIII, as seen by Burchard, were concerned only with liturgical questions. He, as was said, passed his working life in the glories of the Sixtine Chapel, yet never a word of description is written of the Great Chapel. He lived in the Rome of Raphael and Michelangelo, but the dry German prelate seemingly was uninterested. Gregorovius, that fervent East Prussian Protestant, has a great passage on the foundation stone of the new St. Peter's. He declares that everyone present that day must have realized the revolutionary act which was taking place, the destruction of the ancient basilica of Constantine, which was but to be the forerunner of the great revolt of Luther. We know for certain that Burchard seemed quite unaware of the historical event. He was concerned only with the ceremony. We know for certain, too, there was another man there that day also unaffected by the historical moment, Paris de Grassis, Burchard's assistant, whom Burchard kept in complete ignorance of the ceremonial to be carried out that day. Paris de Grassis had his revenge in his private obituary notice of the late Burchard, whom he accused of stealing, from under the nose of Julius II, one of the coins placed in the foundation stone! This function was simply a piece of work to be done by a craftsman, who knew every trick of the trade. To give an example of the liturgical notes which make up the bulk of Burchard's work, here is his entry for Palm Sunday, 19th March, 1497, during Alexander VI's reign:

Dominica Palmarum, XIX martii, ss. d. n. papa paratus more solito benedixit et distribuit palmas in capella majore palatii, et fuit penuria palmarum; propterea cardinalibus tantum et oratoribus date sunt ac duci Gandie et d. Piscauri....Post palmarum distributionem d. Gundisalvus Fernandi, capitaneus, etiam interfuit in dicta capella et noluit habere locum suum in gradibus solii pape, sed sedit in banco oratorum laicorum....et noluit recipere palmam....de quo, cum rr. dd. cardinales et alii factum considerarent, mirarentur: suscitatus causam, intellexi id actum esse propter ducem Gandie, filium pape. Nolebat enim predictus Gundisalvus capitaneus quod d. dux precederet: in quo tamen ratione non utebatur, sed mala et sinistra opinione propria. R. d. cardinalis Beneventanus dixit missam solemnem in dicta capella, papa presente, et habuit unam palmam tantum: passionem dixit diaconus noster cum duobus cantoribus capelle nostre in paramentis violaceis; alia more solito....

Burchard from 1494 began to record more than liturgical affairs. From his excellent post to watch the great affairs and men of the court of Alexander VI, he began to note the great happenings of the reign, and thus he became an historian of the momentous period. He will give, for instance, a snapshot of Alexander VI, off guard, a scene enacted centuries ago yet caught for ever by Burchard:

Dominica tertia adventus, XIIII decembris [1494] r. d. cardinalis Carthaginensis celebravit missam solemnem in capella majore palatii apostolici, papa presente: et non fuit sermo quia infirmus erat et debilis procurator ordinis sancti Augustini illum facturus. Rr. dd. cardinales Ascanius et Sancti Severini etiam interfuerunt huic missae, infra quam idem cardinalis Ascanius astitit pontifici ad sinistram et per totam missam papa fuit cum eo locutus etiam post elevationem sanctissimi sacramenti; cum esset tempus standi, sedebat ut commodius cum co loqueretur. Alia observata sunt more solito.

Alexander VI had, generally, an intense interest in the liturgy, and this unhappy incident was caused by the report that Charles VIII of France had captured in his advance on Rome some interesting members of Roman society. Burchard kept a watchful eye on the young Cardinal Caesar Borgia, noting with care his presence at, and then the frequent absences from, the papal functions, so we are not surprised to read one of Burchard's driest comments:

Feria sexta, XVII dicti mensis augusti [1498], fuit secretum consistorium in quo r.d. cardinalis Valentinus proposuit ab ineunte etate in animo se inclinatum fuisse statui seculari: SS. autem D.N. omnino voluisse ut se daret et inclinaret statui ecclesiastico, propterea ipsum tot supervenientibus dignitatibus ecclesiasticis et beneficiis condonasse et ad ordinem diaconalem promoveri voluisse, cujus voluntati se opponere sibi visum non est. Cum autem omnis animus et desiderium et inclinatio sit adhuc continuo prout semper fuit ad statum seculare, supplicavit SS. D. N. ut dignetur cum singulari clementia prosequi et semet dispensare ut, omissis habitu et dignitate ecclesiastica, liceat ei redire ad seculum et matrimonium contrahere, ac rr. dd. cardinales rogavit quatenus hujusmodi dispensationi consentire et pro illius obtentu, una cum et pro eo, eidem SS. D. N. supplicare vellent dispensationem liberam de omnibus ecclesiis, monasteriis et quibusve beneficiis ecclesiasticis que ipse d. Valentinus obtinebat, eidem SS. D. N. relinquens. Cardinales omnes communi et concordi voto remiserunt dispensationem hujusmodi voluntati et arbitrio ss. d. n. pape.

Gregorovius, that fervent East Prussian Protestant, exclaims that, when Caesar Borgia said he had always wished to be a layman, he spoke the truth for the first and the last time in his life! Burchard makes no comment, as usual. And soon he is presiding at a great ceremony at which the former Cardinal of Valentia appears in all his glory as the Duke of Valentinois, Captain General of the Church! The master of ceremonies was busy also during those years with other members of the Borgia family, as he saw to the arrangements of the marriages of Lucrezia and Jofre Borgia. He watched with impassivity Duke Caesar begin his political struggle to overcome the Roman barons, weld the States of the Church into a strong state, with dreams of kingly

rule. The ever smiling Duke is in practically all of Burchard's pages with the dreaded Don Micheletto (Caesar's private executioner) and the superb bodyguard of 10,000 men. The murder of the Duke of Gandia, Caesar's brother, was a terrible warning to these worldly minded men. Every body that was fished out of the Tiber was put to Caesar's account, but Burchard, who had no love of the Borgias, is far more sober. The idea that the Duke of Gandia was murdered by his brother never occurs to Burchard, who finds a far more likely reason. Burchard's description of that sad affair is classic. He tells at great length how on Wednesday, June 14, 1497, Caesar and his brother dined with their mother, whom Burchard calls *Vannocia,*[6] at her vineyard *"prope ecclesiam sancti Petri ad Vincula"*. In the night, the two brothers rode back to the Apostolic Palace. When they reached the palace of Cardinal Ascanio, a palace which had been built by Alexander VI and given to the cardinal for a certain great service, the Duke of Gandia left his brother to go on alone to the Vatican while he, accompanied by one footman, and a man whose face was covered with a mask, who had been seen with the Duke of Gandia for some time past, rode off, as Burchard remarks, *alibi solatii causa.* Having ridden *usque ad Plateam Judeorum,* the Duke told the footman to wait there until eleven o'clock. If his master had not returned by then, he was to go home. Accompanied by the masked man, whom he had taken up on his horse, the Duke rode off, *quo equitavit nescio*.. On Thursday morning, no one was alarmed when the Duke did not appear, because as Burchard laconically remarks it might be difficult for the Duke *exire puelle domum illa die.* Panic grew as the day progressed, and as night fell the pope, *omnino contristatus ac totis visceribus commotus,* ordered a search to be made. Finally the police questioned a certain *Georgius Sclavus,* who was guarding wood in a barge on the Tiber that night. He was awakened by two men coming to the river bank at about five in the morning of Thursday. He noticed that they were very anxious to see that no one was about. They were joined by two other men, and the group then signalled a horseman, who came riding a white horse on which was the body of a dead man. The body was thrown into the river *cum omni vi et potentia. Interrogavit eos adstans insidens equo si decidisset, illi autem responderunt*: "Signor si". But it was then seen that the mantle of the dead man was floating on the river. The terrified, but well hidden, onlooker saw them throw stones which eventually caused the mantle to disappear.

---

[6]Vanozza Catanei (1442-1518).

Naturally the police asked this perfect witness why he had not at once informed the authorities of this event? His reply is illuminating: *....respondit se vidisse, suis diebus, centum in diversis noctibus varie occisos in flumen projici per locum predictum, et nunquam aliquo eorum ratio habita fuit....* Then began the dreadful fishing for the body which prompted unfeeling epigrams from the scum who battened on the Curia.[7] Burchard always interested in the number present at any ceremony says some 300 *piscatores et natatores* took part in the search. In the afternoon, the body of the unfortunate Duke, fully clothed, with money intact, as Burchard cruelly observes, and stabbed in nine places, was found. A confused procession bore the body to the church of S. Maria del Populo, *cum magno fletu et ululatu.* And Alexander VI? *Pontifex, ut intellexit ducem interfectum et in flumen, ut stercus, projectum, compertum esse, commota sibi fuerunt omnia viscera et pro dolore et cordis amaritudine reclusit se in quadam camera et flevit amarissime.* It is well known that Alexander VI, who had all the facile temperament of the Borgia family, resolved most seriously to be more the Pope than the Renaissance prince. Unhappily his designs for the advancement of Duke Caesar Borgia soon enough caused the murder of the Duke of Gandia to be forgotten. The Holy Year of 1500—surely one of the great landmarks of history—was celebrated with great decorum and devotion, under the skilled guidance of Burchard. The Pope's health was of major importance to Caesar Borgia's plans, and the magnificent Spaniard boasted that, although advanced in years, he was in perfect health. On Saturday, August 12, 1503, the Pope, however, fell ill of a fever. All the remedies of the useless medical science of the time were of no avail. On Friday, August 18, a little after noon the Pope made his confession, heard mass and received Holy Communion; later in the afternoon he received Extreme Unction. The pope died that evening. There is something terrifying in the frantic lashing out of Caesar Borgia, likewise afflicted with fever. His henchman Don Micheletto hastened with troops to the Apostolic Palace, sealed the doors, demanded keys and removed large sums of money, which Burchard speaks of with the lingering care of a lover. Then only was the death of the pope announced, and with it, the downfall of the Borgia clan. Grandeur and misery were the only elements in the life of the Renaissance prince. Left abandoned, the body of Alexander VI was

---

[7]In Alex. VI Pont Max.

Piscatorem hominum ne te non, Sexte, putemus
Piscaris natum retibus tuum.

prepared for burial by Burchard. He gives a minute account of the manner in which he did this. Burchard did not leave the Vatican until three in the morning. He still had much to do before snatching a little sleep, as he had to see to the sending out of the notices for the function of the following day and to arrange for 200 torches being prepared—at all funerals, and he attended many, Burchard was always most careful to count the torches, seemingly few torches meant a poor funeral. Very few of the clergy attended in the Sixtine Chapel, only 111 *Fratres Predicatorum*, for instance, and in spite of all his efforts, he mustered only 145 torches. No disgrace was spared by nature to Alexander VI. With that detached impassivity that marks every page of the *Journal*, Burchard describes the body:

Et continuo crevit turpitudo et nigredo faciei adeo quod....facies erat sicut pannus vel morus nigerrimus, livoris tota plena, nasus plenus, os amplissimum, lingua duplex in ore, que labia tota implebat, os apertum et adeo orribile quod nemo videns unquam adesse talem dixerit".

This cruel description of human mortality was written coolly by one who had owed his position, fine house and money to the dead man who had been the Vicar of Christ, *Petri dignitas etiam in indigno herede non deficit*. But worse is to follow:

In sero, post XXIIII, portatus fuit pape de dicto loco ad capellam de Febribus et depositus iuxta murum in angulo ad sinistram altaris per VI bufulcos ludentes et blasfemantes sive contra papam sive in spretum cadaveris et II magistros lignarios, qui capsam fecerunt nimis strictam et nimis curtam, asectarunt (?) sibi de parte mitram et coperuerunt cum illo antiquo tapete et cum pugnis pistarunt cum vi ut capsam intraret, sine intorticiis vel lumine aliquo et sine aliquo presbytero vel persona una que eius curam haberet.[8]

When one thinks of the list of the members of the curia, given solemnly each year by Burchard, who deserted the dead pope, one cannot help but think that if only the pure Adrian VI, in spite of his lack of statesmanship could have lived a few years more these barbarians would have received their deserts.[9]

Burchard attended the conclave that elected the short lived, good

---

[8]The same dreadful scene was enacted also after the death of the Cardinal of Modena (J. B. Ferrari), whose coffin likewise was found to be too small. *Requiescat in pace*, writes Burchard, *"Doleo ex animo hunc erga pauperes fuisse tam crudelem et salutis sue immemorem, qui omni liberalitate, benignitate et gratia erga me usus est. Omnipotens Deus dignetur miserere anime sue*—Burchard gives two full pages of cruel epigrams on his benefactor's death, for instance: *Bos bona, terra corpus, Styx animam.* A grazing bull was the armorial bearing of the Borgias.

[9]It is interesting to note that each year Burchard, by command of the Pope, obtained a complete list of the officials down to the *Bullatores* and the *Magistri plumbi*. These officials were then informed that their presence was required at the Corpus Christi procession under the penalty of a fine. Under fine, too, they were ordered to remain until the conclusion of the ceremony! There is no mention in Burchard's account of the black dog (the devil?) which sensational writers usually speak of in connection with Alexander VI's death.

Pius III. He saw, too, the almost pathetic spectacle of Caesar Borgia still surrounded by pomp and circumstance, yet a beggar, in fear of his life. Leaving Rome, he eventually returned to Spain, where, after long detention, he fell fighting at the age of 32. With Julius II, Burchard seems to have been on good terms, for on quite a few times he mentions the pope laughed at him during the ceremonies! One of these occasions was piquant. The pope had blessed the wax *Agnus Dei* and distributed them. Burchard received one as master of ceremonies, but as he tells us he joined up with the bishops and received another, but Julius II had noticed his Burchard and laughed. Julius II named him bishop of Orta and Civita Castellana, and it was a proud day when Burchard notes the name of the celebrant in the Great Chapel as: Ego episcopus Ortanus....Yet he remained Master of Ceremonies. Seemingly he could not tear himself from the scene of his life's work, which was, of course, also very lucrative![10] A day came when the Bishop of Orta could not walk. Paris de Grassis triumphed, but, too soon, for the Pope, when he entered the Sixtine Chapel, to his amusement found Burchard ready to direct the function from a chair. Almost at death's door Burchard, as was said above, was in charge of the ceremonies on Low Saturday, April 18, 1506. The pope was carried *ad fundamentum ....pro structura novi chori pro impositione primarii lapidis, qui erat ex marmore in formam tabule sine epitaphii....habens litteras in eo sculptas in hanc formam: JULIUS II PONT. MAX. HANC. BASILICAM FERE COLLABENTEM REPARAVIT ANNO DOMINI MCCCCCVI, PONT. SUI ANNO III.*

The last entry in the *Journal* was made by Burchard on Monday, April 27, 1506, seemingly as alert and as much interested as in 1484 in liturgical problems. He died on May 16 and was buried with decent pomp in S. Maria del Populo, accompanied to the grave by the light of 43 torches! Paris de Grassis, a Bolognese, his successor, pounced on the *Liber Notarum* of one whom he describes as the *magnus trimagister et trigenialis ceremoniarum nostrarum,* but he found he could not decipher Burchard's scrawl, and he vented his rage on the dead bishop by telling all manner of stories about him.

Finally, why was Turmel interested in Burchard? Because un-

---

[10]The *Journal* reveals Burchard as keenly interested in the rewards of his profession. He had a tidy number of benefices, his episcopal revenue (which does not appear to have been large), his salary and the glorified tips he obtained from princes and cardinals for his services at various ceremonies. In his younger days, he lamented bitterly the 'theft' by the sacristan of St. Peter's of the bed on which Sixtus IV died. It belonged by custom to the Master of Ceremonies, but it was removed while he was preparing the body of the pontiff for the grave.

happily Burchard besides being interested in the liturgy also had a penchant for nasty stories. The cool way he writes down these infamous things in order to record them for future use is simply amazing. Some were true, others are the result of clever Italians pulling Burchard's German leg so far that it was almost pulled off. These stories are relatively few in number and are widely scattered in the thousand pages of the *Liber Notarum*.[11]

To read Burchard is to come in as close contact with the men of Renaissance Rome and their doings as is now possible.[12] One feels after closing the *Liber Notarum* that Burchard, somewhere, is counting the number present at a function, settling down to listen to the sermon,[13] and that he will close his note with his inevitable: *omnia alia more solito*.

T.V.

* * * *

HEINRICH PESCH, S.J. (1854-1926)

In a cemetery at Valkenburg in Holland, three graves bear a name which is closely associated with the modern resurgence of Scholasticism. To students of theology and philosophy, two of the bearers of that name have long been familiar figures—Christian Pesch and his elder brother, Tilmann; these Jesuit scholars have established themselves in their respective fields and some of their works are still standard.

When Heinrich Pesch was laid to rest beside his illustrious brothers

[11]The most important of these stories from the historical point of view is the so called account of the *Convivium meretricum*, 30 October, 1501. Burchard says he was told (hence he was not an eyewitness) that Duke Caesar Borgia entertained a very mixed gathering in his rooms at the Vatican, including *quinquaginta meretrices honeste*. Before Alexander VI and Lucrezia Borgia unmentionable things were done. Pastor and Gregorovius reject Burchard's account as something that only an evil imagination could conjure up. Alexander VI was a genial man and a gentleman. A party given by Caesar Borgia was the fact upon which this monstrous story was built. Burchard gives the story in all its crudity; a version ad usum delphini can be seen in Gregorovius, *Lucrezia Borgia*, London, 1948 (Phaidon), p. 115 (note 50). Turmel, naturally, holds the account to be true, but careful historians have rejected it. During the Holy Year of 1500 the Penitentiaries told Burchard some hair raising accounts of moral cases, on the one topic men of the Renaissance found amusing, of course. One of these so called stories had already been told by Boccaccio! It is a shock and a pity to see this trait in our Burchard's character.

[12]Burchard gives many descriptions of events happening in the city—public executions (grim and prolix accounts); curious punishments of criminals; the occupation of the city by the French under Charles VIII, when Burchard's house and stables were taken over for a few days; the weather, *etc.*

[13]Burchard's only relaxation during the functions was, when he got his men seated, he could listen to the sermons. The shortest sermon was the best sermon in his opinion. Sometimes he will give a brief resumé of a sermon that appealed to him. An unlucky preacher, who sought with frantic efforts to find a way to end, gave Burchard some very happy times.

on 1st April, 1926, however, he, too, had completed a life of equal scholarly achievement. And if his reputation to-day is less extensive than that of his brothers, it is because his work was done in a field which has drawn less attention from those Catholics, who seek to vindicate scholastic teaching before the bar of modern criticism. Yet, on the basis of Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy, Pesch had elaborated a work of economic theory, which is to this day the most thoroughgoing of all creations by Catholics in the sphere of social thought.

For a comprehensive exposition of his thought, Pesch wrote his monumental life-work, *Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie*;[1] there Pesch constantly emphasises the intimate connection between given economic systems and the social philosophy which informs each. After establishing this truth with regard to Liberalism and Socialism as philosophies and regimes, he looks to the nature of man and of society when elaborating his own adequate social philosophy, called Solidarism; on that social philosophy men may base an economic order, called by Pesch, Ein soziales Arbeitssystem, a social system of industry.

Three propositions, reflecting Pesch's appeal to nature, constantly recur as he unfolds a constructive teaching which showed in his own day that the individualist and collectivist solutions did not exhaust the possible approaches to problems of social and industrial life: "1. Man is lord of the world; 2. Man at work is lord of the world; 3. Man working socially is lord of the world". And since those propositions are founded on the very nature of man and of society, we can say that they are equally as apposite in the present days of industrial unrest, uncertainty and near-anarchy.

But it is not for the purpose of outlining Christian Solidarism that the present note is written; rather is it a memorial tribute to Heinrich Pesch on the 25th anniversary of that humanist social apostle's death. Apart from that grateful dedication, one can only hope on the present occasion that this time of anniversary will witness a resurgence of interest in the valuable thought of the pains-taking, industrious German Jesuit.

In the humble origins of a Cologne shoemaker's dwelling, Heinrich Pesch was born on September 17th, 1854. After studying law and political science at the University of Bonn between 1872-75, Pesch followed his elder brothers into the Society of Jesus in January, 1876. Due to the influence of the *Kulturkampf*, Pesch spent four of his study years at Ditton Hall in England; the impression made by his observation of

[1]H. Pesch, *Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie*, 5 Bde, Freiburg im B., 1905-1923 (Bde I-III, 2d-6th ed., 1924-1926).

the distressful Lancashire industrial conditions during that period did much in determining his particular life interest: to work for the reign of dignity, justice and order in the world of industry.

Pesch was ordained to the priesthood in 1888; his studies over, his assignment for the period 1892-1900 was that of Spiritual Director at the Mainz Seminary. This was long before the day of the priest-worker technique for one who would strive to transform the workers' world; accordingly Pesch's dedication to that cause during the years at Mainz found its practical expression in a literary apostolate. *Liberalismus, Sozialismus und Christliche Gesellschaftsordnung,* a work of over 1700 pages, and numerous articles in the journal *Stimmen aus Maria Laach,* flowed from Pesch's tireless pen during this period. By 1901, however, Father Pesch was resident in Berlin, taking the University's formal course in economics in order to prepare himself for a more intensive endeavour in his chosen field. There is something touching in the thought of this mature man of forty-seven taking his place among his much younger fellow students in order to pursue an ideal. Yet, under such professors as Gustav Schmoller and Adolf Wagner, this is precisely what was done by the ingenuous priest from Mainz; he was thus to emerge from the University better equipped for his projected opus magnum, the *Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie.*

When his course was completed, Father Pesch did not become a student recluse, but integrated his socio-economic research and writing with a practical exercise of his priest's orders. In the Good Shepherd Convent at the Berlin suburb of Marienfelde, he was, from 1910 until 1925, spiritual director to the Sisters of Our Lady of Charity, and chaplain of the several hundred prostitutes and unmarried mothers to whose recovery for Christ the sisters there devoted themselves. "I have been helping in the pastoral care of the poorest of the poor, the victims of the big cities", Pesch wrote in his autobiography, "....Never before did I realize as clearly the importance of the family for man as I do now in my work with these frightened girls..... It is a special comfort to me when I get a chance to lighten the burden of the sick among them or to assist them in their last hour and to pay the last tribute of respect to those who died. Most of the time I am the only mourner who follows the coffin of those lonely people".[2]

That was the atmosphere in which Father Pesch, in spite of a serious, recurring heart ailment, pushed on to the attainment of his ambition as an economist: the completion of his *Lehrbuch.* "I told myself",

[2]*Die Volkswirtschaftlehre der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellung, ed.* F. Meiner, Leipzig, 1924, Vol. I, p. 207.

he has written, "that if you have acquired the fruit of the efforts of the most able scholars, then you have gained much already and you can go on building in your own manner".[3] In that eclectic manner, Pesch proceeded to construct his masterly synthesis of welfare economics whose constant point of reference is the dignity and development of the human person: man working socially is lord of the world. Apart from lesser works and articles, Pesch did see the fifth and final volume of his 4000 page *Lehrbuch,* safely through the Press before his death.

And now those five volumes, impressive from the start in their quality Herder covers, stand before us as a monument to their bearded author's life of courage and industry. But they are more than that. At a time when the Holy Father is asking Catholic intellectuals: "... is it not true that the necessity of the present time is synthesis? Is the danger not already felt that present day science, in so far as that is and must be something generative and watchful regarding civilization, is becoming decadent and losing itself in minutiae, in narrowness, in the absolute predominance of specialization?"[4] Pesch's work is a model to Catholic social thinkers. He effected in his day and for the stage of development of economic insight available to him, the type of synthesis recommended by the present Pope, a recommendation which is likewise strongly emphasised by the late Cardinal Suhard in his 1947 Pastoral on the Church.

It is therefore pleasing to see that it is Father Pesch's avowed followers and those who have been influenced by him, who are responsible for the outstanding works of synthesis in recent years.[5] Study of the *Lehrbuch* will surely inspire similar effort in the future. May we not therefore hope that the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Heinrich Pesch will see this master recognized more extensively for his unquestionable merit? Then we will be so much nearer the fulfilment of a certain passing prophecy made on comparing Pesch with Adam Smith, Karl Marx and Charles Gide: "....it may be that his (Pesch's) final influence, both in extent and in fertility, will prove equal to or even greater than theirs".[6] And if you would know *their* influence, well, circumspice.

N.T.

---

[3]In F. Meiner, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

[4]Pope Pius XII, Allocution to philosophers, 21st November, 1946, *A.A.S.*, v. XXXVIII, pp. 427-8; see, too, address to French University lecturers and students, 21st September, 1950, *A.A.S.*, v. XXXXII, p. 737.

[5]cf. O. von Nell-Breuning, S.J., H. Sacher und Ludwig Wirtz, *Beiträge zu einem Wörterbuch der Politik,* Hefte I-IV, Herder, Freiburg im B., 1947-50; J. Messner, *Das Naturrecht,* Tyrolia-Verlag, Innsbruck, 1950.

[6]E. J. Coyne, S.J., *The Message of Charles Gide* in *Studies,* vol. XXI, 84, Dec. 1932, p. 598.

Book Reviews

THE GLORIOUS ASSUMPTION OF THE MOTHER OF GOD, by Joseph Duhr, S.J. Translated by John Manning Fraunces, S.J., London, 1951: Burns Oates. xi, 153 pp. 8s. 6d. Engl.

This is a translation by a Jesuit of the Maryland Province of a Bonne Presse publication, *La Glorieuse Assomption de la Mère de Dieu.* The English reads well, although the word "explicitate" is hard to take.

Father Duhr's work is an essay on the doctrine of the Assumption from its earliest traces, through hesitations and affirmations, until a day when Pope Pius XII, after consulting his brother bishops whose faith he was to confirm, manifested his intention of proceeding to the definition. The text of the book apparently was completed several years ago and the translation early last year, and hence there is nothing in it about the Bull which is now the chief *locus* on the Assumption doctrine. A photo is seen on the jacket, of the impressive assembly in St. Peter's after the definition, resembling a General Council.

The opponent of definition whom Father Duhr had most in mind was the late Dr. Ernst, of Paderborn, who published his views in 1921. On historical grounds he held that the Assumption could not be regarded as part of the deposit of faith but only as a pious belief not devoid of probability. Father Duhr points out that a fact which is unsupported by historical testimony may become an object of faith, as an historical occurrence, if it is implied in a dogma. Just as the Immaculate Conception was implied in prior dogmas about the Mother of God, so the Assumption. The underlying general principles about the development of dogma are stated in Chapter I. The treatment is summary, yet sufficient for the scope of the essay.

Apocryphal accounts are dealt with in Chapter III. It is pointed out that when Pius V inserted the "euthymiac" story, purporting to be a sermon of St. John Damascene, in the Divine Office for August 18th, the opening words, *"ex antiqua et verissima accepimus traditione"*, were reduced to *"ex antiqua accepimus traditione"*, and the significant omission indicates that the Church did not guarantee the truth of the story. Now that our belief in the Assumption has been placed on the highest dogmatic basis, may we not devoutly hope that the embarassing apocryphal account will soon be deleted from the Breviary? What better substitute could be found than passages from the admirable Bull containing the definition, *Munificentissimus Deus?*

An Appendix outlines the evolution of the manner of representing the Assumption in art. Copious references and a bibliography complete this little book, which is without a rival of its kind in English.

C.R.

* * * *

EARLY CHRISTIAN BAPTISM AND THE CREED, by Joseph H. Crehan, S.J. (The Bellarmine Series), Burns Oates, London, 1950; pp. ix-189; price, 21/-.

This work began as an attempt to reconcile *Mt.* 28, 19, where the Apostles are commanded by Our Lord to baptize in the name of the Trinity, and the *Acts of the Apostles,* where we find baptism being administered "in the Name of Jesus". After a great deal of research, which must have called for utmost endurance, the author arrives at the accepted teaching that "Baptism in the Name of Jesus" means that the candidate himself made a profession of Faith, "calling upon the Name of Jesus", and was baptized forthwith in the name of the Blessed Trinity. The author proves conclusively that although the apparent discrepancy between *Mt.* 28, 19, and Baptism in the Name of Jesus was quite well known to the early Fathers, it was never felt as a difficulty. He establishes beyond doubt that the invocation of the three names by the baptizer can be traced explicitly through the voices of the Fathers, back to St. Justin, who appeals to Apostolic Tradition.

He then discovered that the profession of Faith on the part of the candidate raised the very important question of the origins of the Creed. From this point the work becomes intensely interesting. In the second century he finds traces of a Creed containing articles concerning both Father and Son. His treatment of Tertullian's concept of Baptism as a "pactum fidei", a positive contract entered into by God and the recipient, is not only of great interest but of great importance for our modern times when "infidelity" among Christians is becoming the order of the day.

The author rejects the contemporary state of opinion about the growth of the Creed, i.e., the supposition that there were two nuclei, a Trinitarian short Creed and a Christ-Creed, the two having later merged into one. He is convinced that the Christ-Creed was the primitive form, which, from a simple invocation of the name of Jesus, gradually expanded to embrace explicitly other articles of the Christian Faith. Using his patristic sources with no little ability, he endeavours to give historic reasons for this expansion. The inclusion of the article relating to the Father was probably occasioned, he thinks, by the Marcionite

heresy. The articles referring to the Holy Spirit came of a deeper appreciation of the work of salvation, the merits of which are applied by the Holy Ghost. The facts concerning the Church were introduced to ward off the Montanist heresy. Thus the author concludes that the Apostles' Creed reached its definitive form at the end of the second century, and was the profession of Faith required of a candidate for Baptism, a contract of ineffable importance in the life of the Christian.

The work is an excellent study in patristic theology and will be of great benefit to students in the more advanced stages of their course.

T.M.

* * * *

THE BOOK OF PSALMS, translated by Members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America, New Jersey, 1950.

In 1948 the first volume of a new English translation of the Holy Bible appeared with the publication of the Book of Genesis. This laudable work was undertaken by the members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America, and is sponsored by the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. The second volume of this project is the Book of Psalms and the Canticles of the Roman Breviary. Like Genesis, the Psalms and Canticles have been translated directly from the original languages, and the critical use of all the ancient sources has given to this new version special scientific worth. The basic Hebrew text of the Psalms adopted by the translators agrees, except for a limited number of passages, with the text reproduced in the new Psalter of Pius XII, as contained in the second edition, 1945, and which, of course, has been incorporated into the more recent editions of the Roman Breviary. Hence, this new translation is, as the translators claim, in substantial conformity with the public prayer of the Church.

The translators have endeavoured to remain as faithful as is possible in a translation, to the meaning and spirit of the inspired original. This is an essential characteristic of any truly successful translation of the inspired Word of God. We consider that they have succeeded in this endeavour. The translation, while obviously making use of other American translations of the new Psalter, is, in the opinion of this reviewer, happier in its choice of many a word or phrase than the other translations, and reads much more smoothly than do they. It is to be hoped that the members of the Catholic Biblical Association will not keep an anxious and grateful public waiting too long for their completed translation, the first-fruits of which are so gratifying and first rate. (Our copy from Dwyer).

H.G.D.

PRAELECTIONES BIBLICAE, Propaedeutica Biblica, Simon-Prado, C.SS.R., Turin-Rome, 1950. (Editio sexta retractata).

Attention has already been drawn in the *A.C.R.* to other volumes of the excellent biblical manuals of Simon-Prado. The praise bestowed on other volumes is in order with regard to this work of general introduction, than which no better book of its type exists. The usual questions of Inspiration, Canon, Texts, Versions, Interpretation, are fully and scientifically dealt with; abundant and up-to-date bibliographical data, and summarized accounts of the latest archeological and textual discoveries make this volume a rich treasure of information. The text is copiously supplied with maps and illustrations; photographic reproductions of the proposed reconstructed Jewish Temple, and of pages from various MSS. add to the value of this high-class work.

New to this edition is the author's treatment of the question, *"De sensu implicito"*, so important for a fuller understanding of the economy of divine revelation, of the history of dogma, and on which depends, too, the scientific value of the scriptural proofs in theological discussions touching on Christology and Mariology.

Simon-Prado is always sanely modern, aware of and open-minded on the latest problems; he has, at the same time, a sure sense of what is Catholic, which makes this work a sure, safe, and up-to-date guide. This book can be unreservedly recommended.

H.G.D.

* * * *

THE CHURCH IN THE CHRISTIAN EMPIRE, Vol. I, by J. R. Palanque, G. Bardy and P. de Labriolle. Translated by E. C. Messenger, Ph.D., London, 1949. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 408 pp. 25/-.

Dr. Messenger's brilliant translation of the first two volumes of what he justly calls the monumental *Histoire de l'Eglise* of Fliche and Martin have been welcomed in these pages. He now presents the first of four volumes in English which will give in English the text of the third and fourth volumes of the French original. The present book's core is Gustave Bardy's vivid and informative account of the rise and decline of Arianism. This main theme is introduced by an account of Constantine's motives in tolerating the Church, interesting himself in Donatism and Arianism, while all the while remaining outside the

Church. The great 'Christian' emperor, as is well known, did not receive baptism until he was dying. Constantine took no chances. Constantine and Arianism, no doubt, will be regarded by many readers as hard tack. That attitude historians feel is the fault of the theologians, who condemn Arius as a son of the devil, while in an aside they mention his sad end, who was justly condemned at the Council of Nicaea (325). That is the end for the theologians. But what about the Eusebiuses? Why did Arius propound such a terrible heresy? Do men just say: "Things are quiet; let's have a heresy?" Here it is for the historian to attempt to explain the why and wherefore. This Canon Bardy does in his usual masterly fashion. Arius, like all the great heretics, thought he had a mission from God, namely, to defend the Trinity against the Sabellian danger. To do this he had but to remember Lucian of Antioch, powerful mover of men, who had carried the subordination of the Son to the extent of declaring that He was a creature, although worthy of all adoration. Arius may have imagined also that this method of explanation would prove attractive to the heathens and new converts from the paganism. So the battle opened that was to be waged for sixty years. Arianism was condemned by the 318 Fathers of Nicaea, but it almost conquered the world. Why? Because many of the Fathers, although knowing Arius had gone too far, but poor fellow, they said, in a good cause, yet they were not prepared to accept fully the unscriptural and once condemned technical expression *homoousios,* which Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra and Constantine (!) had forced down their throats. Canon Bardy gives a masterly account of the tremendous battle which St. Athanasius waged against mistaken men. At times, with the exile of Pope Liberius and Hosius of Cordova, the whole world shuddered to find itself Arian. But at the moment of triumph the extravagances of the advanced party of the Arians, the Anomeans under Aetius of Antioch, alarmed the bishops, who, sinking their differences, destroyed the new heathenism at the Council of Constantinople, 381. We have space only to mention in passing the informative chapter contributed by P. de Labriolle, *The Intellectual Reaction Against Christianity* (pp. 242-254), which is of extreme interest. But Bardy's account of Arianism remains the great feature of the book taking its place with Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century* and the provocative *Studies in Arianism* of the Anglican scholar H. G. Gwatkin as one of the principal accounts of the heresy that we have in English. Arianism and the 4th century dry? For Arianism without tears, read Evelyn Waugh's recent novel *Helena.* After that,

Newman, Gwatkin, and then the satisfying Gustave Bardy, of Dijon. Finally Dr. Messenger is at the top of his form in the translation, which is saying much.

T.V.

* * * *

ST. AUGUSTINE, GREATNESS OF THE SOUL AND THE TEACHER (Ancient Christian Writers, 9). *Edit.* Plumpe-Quasten. Newman, Maryland (U.S.A.), 1950. 3 dollars.

The Volume that appears as number nine in the Ancient Christian Writers series, contains the translation of two of the minor works of St. Augustine, the De Quantitate Animae, and the De Magistro. The translation is done with the usual care, and some helpful notes are added, as is the way with the works published in this series.

Some interesting points are raised in the De Quantitate Animae, the title of which is rendered: The Greatness of the Soul. In chapter four justice is presented as a spiritual reality, in what is apparently a survival of Platonism in the mind of Augustine. The few chapters which lead up to chapter thirteen are a preparation for the proof of the immateriality of the soul from the fact that it can apprehend the idea of a point, which has no magnitude. The concept of justice leading to certain equalities and symmetry in plane figures (p. 30) must seem to a modern reader a quaint one. It is interesting to follow the seeking of Augustine after the concept of sensation (c. 25) and reasoning (c. 27); and the final discussion of the various levels of the soul falls far short of the clarity of modern metaphysical psychology, though it is not as vague and useless as a great deal of the Freudian and neo-Freudian terminology.

There are some portions of the translation which must be read several times before they produce any clear impression. Such a sentence as the one on page 32: "Does it have the greatest possible equality, or do you think not?" is a case in point. One might be tempted to ask what is meant by: "picayune questions" (p. 84), and to be amused by the idea of: "a crude perversion which is more wooden than the very trees it takes under its wing" (p. 99); but on the whole the translation reads sufficiently easily.

The De Magistro, called: The Teacher, has been commented upon so often that it is hardly necessary to make any remark beyond noting that the present rendering is clear and careful. A purist might wish to substitute the word 'known' for 'cognized' on page 173.

J.S.K.

ST. ATHANASIUS. The Life of St. Antony. Translated by Robert T. Meyer. Newman Press. Westminster, Maryland, 1950. Price, 2.50 dollars.

The volumes of the *Ancient Christian Writers* being brought out under the general editorship of Professors Johannes Quasten and Joseph Plumpe, of the Catholic University of America, are already well known in Australia. They present in attractive form good translations of Patristic works well introduced and well annotated.

The present volume contains a famous classic in English dress—the encomium of St. Antony of Egypt by his friend Athanasius. There is now no doubt whatever that this biography is from the pen of the Champion of orthodoxy against the Arians. Dr. Meyer says in a dozen pages as much as the ordinary reader will wish to know about the authority, the form and the peculiarities of this highly influential writing. Special attention is drawn to the prominence of diabolical action in the life of the Father of Monks. A long address of Antony himself, which forms more than one fourth of Athanasius' book is almost entirely devoted to the methods of temptation used by the Enemy of human nature.

The translation made by Dr. Meyer is scholarly and accurate, with perhaps a little too much of the ancient movement of the original. No one, however, could call it "musty" English, such as characterised some of the translations of the Fathers made at Oxford a hundred years ago.

The notes, covering 88 pages of text, themselves occupy over 30 pages, and are full of varied information. They can be profitably read separately—preferably before the reading of the text, or, better, before and after. We have one fault to find with those notes. They include numerous Scripture references, which could find more suitable places at the foot of the pages on which the citations occur. This would save the reader the frequent annoyance of turning to a note and finding that it is simply Luke 11, 9, or some such indication.

W.L.

* * * *

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, 1903-1909. The Rectorship of Denis J. O'Connell. By C. J. Barry, O.S.B., Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1950. Pp. ix + 298. 3 dollars 50 cents.

The Catholic University of America at Washington, D.C., has begun the laudable project of selecting writers to tell its story. In three

earlier works the history of the University's foundations and first educational efforts were thoroughly considered. The present volume is the fourth and it deals with the rectorship of Monsignor Denis J. O'Connell (1903-1909). The University has successfully passed over the difficult years of its foundations—and has entered the less spectacular but nevertheless contributing years of academic work and progress.

In this volume, the author, Dom Colman J. Barry, O.S.B., investigates the educational life of the University under O'Connell's rectorship.

This volume is not of any great interest to the Australian reader, for it busies itself with the internal workings of the University. In this period there were five faculties, theology, law, philosophy, letters and science. The first three years, 1903 to 1906, were years of high feeling among the faculty and a struggle between the Rector and the Senate for the governing control of the University, which O'Connell eventually won, and by his victory established the office of Rector as the real authority in the University.

The outside problem of getting the University and its purposes known to the public was O'Connell's work during the last three years of his rule. To the American at large the Catholic University was run by clerics for clerics with the aim of establishing the union of Church and State. O'Connell faced the local problem by a series of lectures in a hotel at Washington which were a great success, and dispelled the hazy notions that "laymen were not allowed there" and that "its teaching was entirely middle age". The speakers were later to become great names in the University, Thomas J. Shahan, later Bishop and Rector, and recognised as the "Newman of America", Edward A. Pace, whose writings and lectures did so much to advance the prestige of the University, and finally Thomas E. Shields, the founder of Sisters' College within the University from which the Catholic Schools of U.S. have gained so much.

On the recommendation of Cardinal Gibbons, O'Connell was elevated to the episcopacy by Pope Pius X, and thus, like Newman, his work with its many bitter controversies and criticisms was acknowledged.

The book is well made with excellent notes, appendices, and illustrations, and for the U.S. is a valuable record of the first all American Catholic University during the rectorship of O'Connell.

J.T.M.

NEWMAN'S UNIVERSITY: IDEA AND REALITY, by Fergal McGrath, S.J., D.Phil. (Oxon.). Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1951, pp. XIII-537. Price in Australia, 46/6.

Newman's celebrated book, *The Idea of a University,* was the fruit of his lectures given to launch the Catholic University at Dublin on its career. His plans are placed before us in that book of serene beauty. How did he carry the plans out? Why did he fail? Father McGrath has set out to give us a complete picture of Newman's work in the Catholic University of Ireland. He deals in the opening chapters with the state of education in Ireland in the 1850's, the position of Trinity College, Dublin, and the introduction by parliament in 1845 of a bill to establish the Queen's Colleges. Trinity was Protestant: the Queen's Colleges were declared by Rome and Catholic Ireland to be 'godless'. Hence the solution was sought in the erection of a Catholic University. Indeed the S.C. of Propaganda, while condemning the Queen's Colleges, urged the Irish bishops to erect a Catholic University on the model of Louvain. The manner in which the Roman wish, and it was also the desire of Pope Pius IX, should be carried out, was a difficult matter for the Hierarchy. It was inevitable in so grave a question that there should be divisions of opinion. However, Cardinal Cullen and the bishops were in general agreement, and so the great undertaking was begun in 1850. Cardinal Cullen opened negotiations to obtain Newman's services as Rector of the new institution. Cardinal Cullen and the Irish bishops saw in Newman rather the author of *The Present Position of Catholics in England* than the scholar who for thirty years had looked at the dreaming spires and the eternal snapdragon of Oxford. Father McGrath, however, rejects the idea that Newman had any idea of importing Oxford to Ireland, or, that he regarded the university as 'a pleasant resort for otiose young men'. Thus Newman, an Englishman, and, further, an Oratorian with obligations at Birmingham, came to found an Irish Catholic University. After Thurles had been considered as a possible site, Dublin was fixed upon as the natural place for the new University. Funds had to be raised; buildings acquired; professors and officials named and agreed upon. Thus the troubles began. Newman undertook long, irksome journeys round the episcopal sees of Ireland. He found division of opinion, and, sometimes, coolness from certain bishops. Dr. MacHale had begun to show another side to his character. Arthur Griffith had declared him to be 'the greatest of the Irish Archbishops of the nineteenth century'; but a candid friend stated

that his 'unwillingness to co-operate, of which O'Connell had complained more than once previous to the repeal movement, became a settled state of mental conviction'. Newman had to endure many a meal of underdone mutton while he preached the pure doctrine about universities: The end of a University is Knowledge. You leave out Virtue, urged his critics, and so the new Catholic University is simply the Queen's Colleges writ large! Explanations followed from the pained Newman. The Bishop of Limerick (Dr. Ryan, 'the cleverest bishop I have met', writes Newman) gave him a great welcome, a dinner (underdone mutton that 'would turn a Tartar's stomach') with songs, but said he claimed the freedom 'to prophesy...failure'. The President of Maynooth was cold towards the project; the Provincial of the Jesuits was most pessimistic; while, worst of all, Cardinal Cullen refused to answer Newman's letters (due to his Roman training is one of the hard-pressed Rector's explanations!). Thus with division among the Irish bishops and people, the unchartered institution opened its doors. Disraeli was approached about the charter later, and it is most instructive to see "Dizzy" give a beautifully smooth performance of displaying great interest, but promising nothing. Newman put no great store on the charter, for he felt the University should, by its own success, win its spurs. Then came the sad affair of the bishopric for Newman, of which Father McGrath gives an interesting account. It soon became evident that students were not being attracted to the new foundation. Father McGrath writes that the cause of failure cannot be found easily. In the 1850's, he points out, there were insufficient Catholic secondary schools to provide a large body of young men seeking higher education; likewise the failure to obtain a charter was detrimental to the immediate success of the new university. Newman is acquitted of the charges commonly urged against him (that he was too much the Oxonian—that he forced Englishmen on the University, *etc.*), although it is admitted, that as an administrator he had weaknesses. One cannot help thinking of Newman's obligations to the Oratory at Birmingham in this matter of administration.

Father McGrath has written for his Oxford thesis a mature book in a cool, masterly way. His numerous quotations from Newman's letters are really magnificent, as the great humanist revels in his descriptions of Irish clerical life, with many very vivid appreciations of character. The excessive use of footnotes is, however, annoying.

And so, Father McGrath leaves us, all bitterness spent, contemplating Newman 'who dreamed of his University being one day "a seat of wisdom, a light of the world, an Alma Mater of the rising generation".'

T.V.

* * * *

A TREASURY OF RUSSIAN SPIRITUALITY, compiled and edited by G. P. Fedotov. (500 pages. Sheed & Ward, London, 1950).

It is regrettable that, in the political and social implications of Russian Communism, most Christians of other countries have lost sight of the treasures of Russian spirituality. The writings of the gifted Berdyaev have found their way into few libraries, we imagine. Those who have read even one or two of his books will recall that one of his most cherished beliefs was that the current of spirituality now submerged in Russia by Communism would break through to the surface again. It behoves teachers to be on their guard against turning out their pupils with an ingrained hostility against the Russians. The social tragedy of that country cannot be understood unless we are acquainted with the spiritual history of their culture. A good book to begin with is Helen Iswolsky's *The Soul of Russia.* Readers of that interesting work will be glad to find a much wider and more detailed treatment of the subject in the book now under review, comprising short biographies of several Russian saints and holy men, with excerpts from their writings. They range from the eleventh century to the present day.

Two thoughts that persist after reading these spiritual writers is their strong belief in the divinity of Christ and their loyal devotion to His Blessed Mother. In the midst of pages of almost savage intensity we feel their chivalry as they speak of *Our Lady of Tenderness.* On the subject of icons, Father Yelchaninov, who died in exile in Paris in 1934, has this to say, referring to sects who disapprove of statues and holy pictures: "While visibly rejecting the icons, they invisibly reject the Incarnation. How degenerate their entire Christianity becomes; and the Eucharist itself, which is the centre of Christian life, becomes an abstraction of no real significance".

All the writers selected in this book belong to the Russian Orthodox Church. Having received Christianity from Constantinople in 988, the whole religious and cultural life was moulded on the Byzantine pattern,

from the days of the first Christians at Kiev. The Greek Fathers were their spiritual guides, and it is no new idea to put forward to say that the lack of Roman order was little short of a disaster in the development of Russian spirituality. Russian culture produced no one to compare with St. Thomas Aquinas; and we are not surprised to see much wild, un-pruned growth in their spiritual gardens. But there is one admirable tendency that persisted throughout the whole religious history of the Russians; it is described by the word *kenotic,* and consisted of the imitation of Christ in His *kenosis,* His self-humiliation and His voluntary, sacrificial death. Such a tendency led naturally to deep influence of the Gospels. This is seen even in the eleventh century; it was not till a century later that Western Christianity received fresh energy by its rediscovery of the Christ of the Gospels. The influence of a personal, suffering Christ on the religious life of a country over centuries is a thought that gives one hope for the millions whose life is rooted in that past.

In 1903 the Russian Orthodox Church canonized St. Seraphim, mystic and prophet who lived and died in the early years of the 19th century, quite unknown to the Russian intelligentsia. Documentary evidence showed him to have been a person of extraordinary spiritual endowments. A biographical note says of him: "A period of severest asceticism, lasting for many years, served as Seraphim's preparation for the life of mystical prayer. He had his terrible struggles with the temptations of the flesh and the spirits of evil, but all this experience was behind him when, at the age of sixty-six, he emerged from his secluded cell and turned to the suffering world as a seer, a healer, and a spiritual guide".

It would be strange if, in that vast country passing through such spiritual darkness, there are not similar souls being raised up by God for the healing and guidance of their fellow-men. It may well be that Western materialism tortured by its hedonism will feel the impact of their holiness, and that it will be from Russia that the coming era of civilization will receive a fresh impulse to run in the way of God's commandments.

M.O.

* * * *

NEUROSES AND SACRAMENTS. By Alan Keenan, O.F.M. Sheed and Ward, 163 p., 7/6. 1950.

This scholarly brief work reflects the times in which we live and in meeting a growing need it shows the Church in her pastoral activities

adapting the timeless remedies of Grace to the developing diseases of the present age. To-day mental therapy looms ever larger in medical science, with enormous hospitals for mind and nerve disorders while neurotics plague the Doctor and the Priest. We are paying the penalty for the pace at which the modern generation moves with its disregard of the limits set by nature to our reserves of strength of body, nerves and mind, as well as of the moral laws. The value of an authoritative study of neuroses from the religious angle is obvious enough.

In medical science the emphasis has shifted from the asylum for the insane to the hospital for the cure of mental illness, and complete recovery is not at all unusual. Since moral disorders and sins as well as scruples and lack of religious balance play a large part in the collapse of the mind, the psychiatrist and medical men often must appeal to religious motives in their treatment. It follows naturally then that the priest can play a big role in healing and helping the neuroses which are submitted to him inside and outside the Confessional. Mixed up with the sickness of sin are often the illusions of worried and neurotic minds so that the physician of the soul needs also to know something of psychology and psychiatry. I have had experience of non-believing doctors asking the guidance of priests in the treatment of Catholic patients whose neuroses were religious. In one case this particular book was studied and used to good purpose.

Fr. Keenan in his treatise synthesises the mental and moral aspects of neuroses. And he does more. For he builds up a solid structure of ascetical theology, worthy of serious study for its own sake. His thesis is that since suffering is the lot of man in carrying the Cross behind Our Lord, the mental and psychical states arising from or producing pain fit into the economy of Redemption; are not necessarily abnormal; if abnormal can be brought back to normality. Neuroses then can be connected with Christ and the Sacraments serve to bring them under the sway of Christ.

Beginning with the demonstration that the Last End of man is the touchstone by which normal man measures his contact with reality, he develops the argument that Our Lord became man to redeem fallen human nature and give all men the opportunity to grow into Christ and so attain the End in God. The Sacraments were instituted to help in the realization of this purpose and each supplies the graces necessary in the various stages of life.

Parallel with this development, Fr. Kennan very competently explains how the difficulties of those who suffer and are affected by

neuroses of different kinds are solved or lessened by the understanding and use of the appropriate sacraments.

The arrangement and scheme of the book make it easy to follow, even in the more technical sections. Chapters are brief and are followed by a summary while each separate part has a short introduction. The style is simple, terse and full of epigrams which serve to illuminate the thought and hold it in the memory. Its use is recommended to clergy and medical men interested in the alleviation of strains and stresses in life, and in suitable cases it may well be out into the hands of sufferers. Its value is twofold, first as a spiritual guide for oneself and then for use in the direction of the more troublesome problems of conscience.

C.D.

* * * *

VESSEL OF CLAY, by Leo Trese. Sheed & Ward: 120 pp; 7/6 Eng.

If you're a Thanks-be-to-God-I'm-not-like-the-rest-of-men priest, perfectly detached from your people, don't read *Vessel of Clay*. It will be weaker than attenuated small beer to you. It will not reach the *pleasant trifle* standard. It will be impudent piffle. But if you're a still-in-the-purgative-way priest, doing your best despite difficulties, buy or borrow the book. It will cheer you through your difficulties and chide you when you are not doing your best.

Father Trese, an American diocesan, has sketched a priest's day, from the morning alarm to the last drowsy thoughts at night. But he crowds a lifetime into a day. In the picture are reflections on: rising, shaving, praying; nuns and altar boys; the Mass and the Sacraments; the school and the sick; eating, reading, and sleeping; parishioners and peddlars and brother-priests; ease and efficiency; courtesy and kindness; sodalities and societies; preaching and teaching; jeeps and jalopys; and all things else.

The subject is old and the topics are not new, but the presentation, for us, anyway, is novel and stimulating. It is American, and we may have to read odd lines twice—to catch the meaning of *pull a boner, prissy, doodle, hot rod,* and the like, although *bingo* and *bump the pot a nickel* scarcely need a glossary in this country. But the real appeal of the book is not in the quaintness of the idiom: it is in the fundamental and frank presentation of facts. It gets right down to earth in expounding priestly problems, and looks right up to heaven for their solution. The school, for instance, is a problem. The priest may be inclined to

leave it to the sisters. Perhaps he has a feeling of inadequacy as he is about to enter the classroom, wondering just how to impart the all-important truths; there is a feeling of frustration, maybe, wondering just how much good will the instruction effect. Father Trese, unblushingly, places not a little of the blame for the post-school failure of Catholic children at the feet of the priest. "After all", he says, "*I* am the shepherd; they are *my* lambs. When they crack under pressure, it isn't lack of knowledge (text books and teachers) that's responsible; it's lack of love. And love is not something that's learned out of books or at a blackboard. It isn't learned at all; it's imparted. It is a fire that is ignited by contact. I would never enter a classroom reluctantly, hesitatingly, if my heart were bursting, as it ought to be, with love for Jesus Christ".

We may not agree with all that the author says, but we must admit that he is a very honest man. Indeed, the publishers claim that Father Trese is one of the most desperately honest men that ever tapped a typewriter. We are inclined to think, by the way, the publisher's claim that the book has great value for the lay reader is somewhat exaggerated. To claim that a study of the priest in all his human failings highlights, by way of contrast, the dignity of his office, and thereby deepens the layman's respect for him, is, to say the least, rather negative argumentation. By all means, let us ever deepen respect for the priest, but, positively, by the consideration of the power and dignity of the office, not by an apology for the mere man. This book is a Particular Exam. for the priest, not for the people.

C.S.P.

* * * *

THE FOUNDATIONS OF PHILOSOPHY. By T. V. Fleming, S.J. Shakespeare Head Press, Sydney. 210 pages. Price, 15/-.

It is a pleasure to note an Australian publication on scholastic philosophy. Father Fleming is to be highly commended on the excellence of this introduction to Philosophy. His scheme is to start with the axioms upon which all thinking is based, and build up a philosophy that finds the middle path between the two extremes of Empiricism and Rationalism. The greater part of the book is concerned with this elaboration of a metaphysics of the real. The last few chapters deal with important questions in special branches of philosophy, such as extension, time and space in Cosmology, and the spirituality of the soul and free will from Psychology. The footnotes are placed to-

gether at the end of the book, presumably because they are intended to serve as a bibliography as well. Otherwise the arrangement is good, and the work is refreshingly up to the moment with references to such recent developments as Hylosystemism, to take only one example.

F.A.M.

* * * *

A PHILOSOPHY OF FORM. By E. T. Watkin. Third Edition, revised and enlarged. Sheed and Ward, London, 1950. Pages XXVIII plus 442. Price, 21/-.

We have in this work the presentation of a philosophy that uses the framework of Scholasticism as a starting point. Matter—viewed as essentially energy—is summarily dismissed, and all attention is given to form. Intuition, or the apprehension of form, is justified as the fundamental process by which we are placed in touch with reality. When we give deliberate consideration to the form which intuition apprehends, then we have contemplation. This book is a plea for contemplation on various levels; these are the contemplation of being in ontological speculation, of the good in contemplation of values, of the beautiful in art, and, finally, religious contemplation covering being and its goodness.

In this third edition the author is able to relate his ideas to the happenings of the fifteen years since the work first appeared. He records such interesting details as Bergson's approach to the "doorstop of the Catholic Church." He admits that the prophecy of the earlier edition, that the Fascist and Communist States would fuse into one, has not been realised; but his analysis of the similarity of their aims and methods remains quite valid.

We may sum up the general pattern of this philosophy as Scholasticism with a strong Platonic flavour. Its stressing of form, the primacy of thought over passion and impulse, the careful analysis of the inadequacy of Freudian psychology, all these are valuable contributions. The author is inclined to place too much stress upon the differences in individual forms; so in the case of man, he weakens the unity of the species, and in general this tendency of his would lessen the certainty and preciseness of our ideas, thus heading towards the same unfortunate result as the Nominalism he so roundly condemns. Altogether, it is a well written and thoughtful work that well repays study.

F.A.M.

MISSION TO THE POOREST, by M. R. Loew, O.P. Sheed and Ward, London, 1950. Pp. 184, 10/6 (stg.).

Followers of the priest-worker experiment to recover the French proletariat to the Church, will find their interest whetted by this latest translation (by Pamela Carswell) of the literature relevant to that movement.

But Père Loew's work, which appeared in French under the title *En Mission Prolétarienne* in 1944, does more than keep alive our interest in an unusual experiment; as a complement to his earlier enquiry into certain social and economic conditions in Marseilles, it stands on its own merits as a serious piece of documentation acquainting us with the facts as met by the experimenters over three years.

To Christianize a chosen situation (a Marseilles dock area), Père Loew began with an investigation of that area; from this first-hand knowledge, acquired as a worker, he will settle on an apostolic approach appropriate to that situation. To this missioner, experience of the attitudes and of the conditions of life affecting those whom he is out to Christianize, is, in a sense, as important as the Gospel message which he brings. In this connection, perhaps no point receives more emphasis than does the necessity for establishing *communauté de destin*: "....if the help which we are eager to render, in whatever form it may be, material or spiritual, is to be welcome and effective, there must always be—if not equality of material conditions—at least the recognition of this *communauté du destin,* and this in turn implies personal presence". (p. 90.)

It is safe to say that nowhere in Australia is the situation as extreme as that faced by Père Loew; but his book reminds us that we need minds informed not only with our precious Christian truth and the principles that are to guide our action, but also with actual knowledge of the conditions to which that transforming action is to be applied. Grace builds on nature in just the same way here in Australia as it does in a Marseilles dock area.

An introduction and epilogue by the versatile Maise Ward, fresh from her *France Pagan?* interest, add to the merit of this book.

N.T.

* * * *

WHO ARE THE SISTERS OF MERCY? By A. J. Goodman, M.S.C. Annals Office, Kensington, N.S.W. Price, 1/-.

This interesting pamphlet of sixty pages traces the story of the Sisters of Mercy, their foundress, the spirit of the institute, and its

world-wide expansion, especially to Australia. The author seems to have overlooked the founding of one branch, the Sisters of Mercy of Yass. The story is told for us by "John O'Brien" in "In Diebus Illis". (*A.C.R.*, 1945, p. 223). Dr. McAlroy intended to obtain sisters from Tullamore; he was caught in a storm and took refuge in the convent at Rochfort Bridgt. He told them of his quest for sisters, and the whole community volunteered for work in a land of which up to that time they had scarcely heard. It is little wonder that with such a spirit the Sisters of Mercy have prospered to become so great an institute; they are not, of course, the largest in the Church, as was erroneously stated in the last number of the *Record* by a reviewer of a similar work. Father Goodman tells us they have 25,000 members, and form the second largest order of women in the Church to-day. We heartily recommend this booklet and hope it may achieve its purpose of increasing vocations to the Sisters of Mercy; they are doing so much for the Church in Australia, particularly in the vital field of education.

F.A.M.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

MENTAL PRAYER AND MODERN LIFE—A symposium—translated by Francis Lehner, O.P. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 202 pages. Price, 2 dollars 75 cents.

The Christian life is of its nature a supernatural one and has a consequent demand for perfection in its aspirants. Now the necessity of prayer becomes evident when we realise that we are not made perfect in spite of ourselves, but must ask, pray for, and use the means of attaining to that excellence which is a full Christ-centred life.

Such a goal is reached primarily with the assistance of the intrinsic efficaciousness of the Sacraments and the inexhaustable merits of the Mass. These are the aids which come from God alone. Prayer and the practice of virtue are the contributions to sanctity which we make in co-operation with the grace of God.

The unquestionable urgency of prayer is the constantly recurring lesson put forward in these very sincere and practical pages. Various writers have each taken a different aspect of the subject and set out to impress on every man the realisation that prayer is not beyond him; indeed, that it is a real need in his spiritual life.

The seven collected articles are arranged in three sections. Firstly, there is a series of historical considerations of terms such as "prayer" itself, "contemplation," "meditation," and so forth. What these words mean; who first proposed the systems connected with them; what were the teachings these contained; how they developed. All these points are interestingly dealt with in a skilful blending of factual detail and ascetic theology.

Part two proposes the theological implications of prayer under titles such as "Method in Prayer," and "The Virtues and Gifts in Prayer". The first provides methods of prayer for the inquirer to choose from, and warns of those which ought to be avoided. In the second mentioned study we are told of the relation between

the Holy Ghost and our prayer, which the author tells us is "a fullness of activity on the part of the grace within us".

Finally, in part three, dealing with the practical side of the subject, two articles present suggestions for: "Making one's life a Prayer", and for "Putting the Gospel in our midst". Again, there is a consideration on "Liturgy and Lay Life," and another on "The Old Testament is a Book of Prayer".

A notable feature of this whole book, and one which earns it a place among works to be recommended to religious and lay people alike, is its simple, satisfying treatment of the aspects of a big subject which were chosen to be included.

The book is further enhanced by its brisk presentation and an absence of any distraction from side-tracking into unnecessary detail. Reference numbers are left in the work, whilst any needed notes and considerations are grouped at the end of the text; an asset rather than a fault by reason of the fuller information which may be thus given.

M.N.

SPECIALISTS IN

WALL & FLOOR TILES

ARCHITECTURAL AND
BUILDERS' HARDWARE

●

ZIEMAN PARKER & GRAHAM PTY. LTD.

201 CLARENCE ST., SYDNEY,
BETWEEN KING AND MARKET STREETS.

●

TELEPHONES — BX 5566, BX 5567, BX 5568